E. L. S. E.

Metalinguistic Dictionary

Arad, 2021

About the *language-use* it has been said, actually, almost everything that was to say. But there has been said and it continues to be said also things – too many – which would have been better not to be said. **(Coșeriu 2009: 36)**

Marius Golea

METALINGUISTIC DICTIONARY

Arad, 2021

Note: E.L.S.E., on the external cover no.1, it is the pseudo name of Marius Golea.

We dedicate this work to the great – and amongst the greatest! – linguist: Eugeniu Coșeriu.

Content

Foreword

We are expressing here, once more, our deep conviction that the mankind has reached an evolution point where the access to education / information must be general and for free. Offering for free, on Internet, the electronic variants of the books/articles, it must become, as soon as possible, a general practice, so that the creative potential of the mankind not to be wasted, by keep using the burdensome and cumbersome way of sequentially studying books printed on paper, and by keep writing/typing again the quotations which have been already typed down by the original authors! This is going to open a great opportunity for acquiring speed in research, and for spending the mankind's time and the energy on the creative side. Instead of reading, painstakingly, tens of book in order to find the pieces of needed information, let's electronically find and select the searched for paragraphs/notions, and let's spend our time, instead, for creatively employing them on the research directions which we are committed to! That has nothing to do with lowering the quality in education, on all levels! A contrary, it is the present way of increasing the achievements in originality and in creativity, during a lifetime, by reducing the waste of time on an outdated and obsolete study method!!!

Consequently, we recommend to the reader, when studying the present dictionary, not to limits his research only to a chapter, or to the searched for definition, but rather to use the electronic way of searching for terms, because of not being possible to frame a certain fragment, exclusively, into a given category. In the vast majority of the quotes, it is about several aspects and notions. For instance, a definition speaking about *translation*'s problem, it refers to the semiotic categories of signifier and of signified etc. In the same logic, for instance, Eugeniu Coșeriu can be found in all chapters, from semiotics to (and especially!) general linguistics.

We hope that the terms / definitions/ quotes taken from Coșeriu's works, they will constitute a foretaste of the great work of this - amongst the greatest – linguist, and it will be an invitation to search for the indicated quoted sources, and to study them in detail –, and it will even be an invitation to ask for their translation in English, when necessary.

We recommend to the reader, to start studying the Coșeriu's definitions/terms, by firstly approaching the definitions of the two fundamental terms which his whole linguistic theory is based on: *language* and *language-use*. Understanding these terms is paramount for understanding Coșeriu's whole work. These terms are the translation of: *langage / parole* (Saussurian) as proposed to us by University Professor Habil. Loredana

I

Pungă, the Dean of the Faculty of Letters, History, and Theology, from the West University of Timisoara.

As a matter of fact, we have applied this distinction upon all the chapters of the present dictionary, though in other chapters than that focused on Coșeriu's linguistics, this distinction isn't so obviously needed to be done. In order to created a *plural* to the term *language-use* we employed the following translation solution: *language-use*(s); for expressing the possessive, we've employed: *language-use*'s.

We have made this dictionary available to everybody interested in, in electronical variant, so that the researcher will be able to use the „Search" function from „Search" menu, in Adobe Acrobat Reader texts editor, in order to find out, for instance, all the occurrences of the syntagm "genus humile" (by the way, there is only one…); or, for instance, all the contexts / definitions which the syntagm "linguistic facts" occurs in… We strongly believe that making your intellectual work available for free, to anybody interested in, it is a way to manifest your patriotism to the mankind, though, nowadays, the human civilization is only in its very early childhood and this idea is going to encounter a strong resistance…

We regard the present dictionary only as a work instrument, as a tool, so that it can be and it should be submitted to revisions and criticism. So, it isn't, by any means, perfect! ("Only God creates perfect things" (Țuțea, Petre. 1993. *321 de vorbe memorabile/231 Memorable Sayings*)).

We owe special thanks to univ. prof. PhD Eugenia Bojoga, a great linguist from Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, the so devoted **disciple** of Eugeniu Coșeriu, and who is the main organizer and coordinator of the Eugeniu Coșeriu Summer School, and the one who unveiled us, for the first time, in May 2020 - by attending the mentioned school -, the great linguist Eugeniu Coșeriu and his paramount works on *general linguistics*.

The author encourages the reader to distribute for free, on all forms and formats, the present dictionary, to whomsoever would be interested in.

Marius Golea

Semiotics

A	
Abduction (semiotic)	Operation which a new concept is formed through, on the basis of an already existing concept, perceived as having something in common with the newly formed concept (Sebeok 2002: 190)
Abstract concept	Mental form whose external referent cannot be demonstrated or noticed in an unmediated manner (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Adapt (to)	Fitting to reality through current use (Sebeok 2002: 14)
Adaptation	Activity for adapting to reality through current use (Sebeok 2002: 173, 186)
Adaptor	Corporal manifestation indicating or satisfying a certain emotional state or need: for instance, scratching your top of the head, in situations of perplexity; scratching your forehead when being anxious (Sebeok 2002: 190)
Affective display	hands movements and facial expressions communicating an emotional signification (Sebeok 2002: 190)
Alliteration	Repeating the initial consonants of other characteristics of the words (Sebeok 2002: 190)
Anthropo-semiosis	Semiosis at humans (Sebeok 2002: 190)
Artefact	An object produced or shaped through the man's craftsmanship, especially a tool, a weapons, of an adornment of archaeological or historical interest (Sebeok 2002: 190)
Artefactual environments	Environments such as" books, paintings, sculptures, letters etc. produced by people on the purpose of conveying messages (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Artificial model	Artificially produced model, namely intentionally produce, by man (Sebeok 2002: 194)

B	
Bifacial sign	The sign is bifacial: the sign is composes of two inseparable halves: one is aistheton, perceptible (or sensitive), the other one is noeton, intelligible (or rational): the signifier, an appreciable impact upon at least one of the sensory organs of the interpreter, and of the signified content (Sebeok 2002: 61)
Bio-semiotics	A branch of the semiotics aiming to study the semiosis, the shaping, and the representation at all forms of life (Sebeok 2002: 190)
Binary opposition	Minimal difference between two shapes (Sebeok 2002: 195)

C	
Channel	Physical means which a signal or a message is sent through (Sebeok 2002: 190)
Classifying the signs according to their	This is an important, apparently universal classification of the signs, taking in consideration the types of referents. It is organized in four

types of referents	semantic classes: objects, event and states related to these events, abstractions, and relational(s). In a way, the relational(s) also represent abstractions, but they function so distinctively, that it is good to treat them as a separate class. (Nida 2004: 47)
Code	A system of signifier elements that can be unveiled in order to represent types of phenomena in specific modalities (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Codes accompanying the text	There are two kinds of codes accompanying a text: (a) the genre with the texts belongs to; (b) accompanying activities, as there would be the music and the scenic movement (Nida 2004: 82)
Codification	Using a code on the purpose of producing some shapes (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Coevolution	The social-biological theory according which the genes and the culture develop in tandem (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Cognitive style	An individual modality which the information and the data are processed in (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Communication	The capacity of participating together with other organisms to receiving and processing some specific types of signals (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Concept	Mental form (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Concrete concept	Mental form whose external referent is demonstrable and it is noticeable in an unmediated manner (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Connotated (conotatum)	Extended signification of a form (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Connotation	Extension of a shape upon a new signifier domain that substitutes, by being implied, the traits of that form (Sebeok 2002: 191) Subjective, affective, and variable elements, of the word's significance (Hjelmslev 1968: 98). This affective charge it is supposed in the case of the denotation, and it is of several types: stylistic, social-political, aesthetical, of the verbal etiquette (Șerban, Evseev 1978: 14-19). There are collective connotations in language and there are connotations causing diverse reactions to the receptors, being created by cognitive context (Lungu-Badea 2003: 35)
Connotational extensional shaping	The process of extending the significations of the primary shapes on the purpose of comprising connotative significations (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Connotative signification	It implies the extension upon something else (Sebeok 2002: 24)
Context	Physical, psychological, and social situation, which a shape uses to occur in, or which hints to that shape (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Conventional sign	Sign not having any obvious connection with any perceptible characteristic of its referent (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Culture	The system of daily existence coagulated by a signifier order (signs, codes, texts, connective shapes) (Sebeok 2002: 191)

D	
Decoding	Using a code in order to decipher shapes (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Deixis	Process of hinting to something by pointing or by specifying that something, in a way or another (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Denotated (denotatum)	The initial signified of a sign (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Denotation	Initial signification, or intentional signification, captured by a shape (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Denotative signification	A prototypical image marked by specific distinctive traits (Sebeok 2002: 24)
Derived adaptation	The language developed as an adaptation, while the speaking developed as a "derived" adaptation (Sebeok 2002: 76, 186)
Diachronicity	Changing as shape in time (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Distinctive trait	A minimal element composing a shape and which, by itself or in combination with other distinctive traits, it serves to differentiate the shape's signification from the signification of other shapes (Sebeok 2002: 197)

E	
Emblems	Gestures translating words or expressions in an unmediated manner: ex.: the "okay" sign, the "come here" sign (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Environment	Technical or physical means which a message is conveyed through (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Extensional shaping	Extending some primary models both morphologically and connotatively, aiming other representational uses (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Extensionality	Process of extending the physical composition of the signification of the shapes (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Exteriorized shape	Shape designated as replacement for somebody/somethings (Sebeok 2002: 192)

F	
Fetish	Object believed to have some magical or spiritual powers or that it can cause sexual arousal (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Firstness	The first strategy of knowing an object through senses (Sebeok 2002: 195)
Flexion	Variations or changes of the words in order to indicate their own relations with other words (Sebeok 2002: 192)

G	
Gesture / gesticulation	Using the hands and, in a smaller measure, the head, in order to produce all kinds of body signs (Sebeok 2002: 192)

I	
Icon	A shape simulating, in a way or another, its referent (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Iconic signs	The iconic signs are based on a similarity between sign and referent (the referent's image, metaphors) (Nida 2004: 46)
Iconicity	Operation of representing the referents through iconic shapes (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Impulse (drive)	Innate impulse telling the animals when to migrate, when (and how) to initiate the nuptial rite, when to feed their cubs etc. (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Index	Shape establishing a continuity with its referent (by showing, by indicating the referent's relation with other things etc.) (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Indexical signs	The indexical signs are based more on associates than on similitudes ("the arms of a clock", metonymies) (Nida 2004: 46)
Indexicality	Operation of representing some referents through indexical signs (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Induction	Operation of deriving a concept from individual deeds or circumstances (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Innenwelt (the internal world)	The world of the internal experiences of a species (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Internal model	Mental shape, mental image (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Interpretant	The mode which the structure makes possible in, the specific connection between sign and its referent (Sebeok 2002: 45)
Intertextuality	The referents present in a text and hinting to referents from another texts (Sebeok 2002: 193)

K	
Kinetic code	Gestures and posture, as also other forms of the body language (Nida 2004: 50)

L	
Language	Semiotics and verbal interpretation (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Linguistics (from semiotic point of view)	Linguistics, as Carnap specified (1942: 13) "it is the empirical and descriptive part of the semiotics (of the spoken or written languages)" (Sebeok 2002: 67) The semiotics must provide the "meta-language for linguistics" (Sebeok 2002: 67) Linguistics, in Saussure's vision, it was meant to serve as model ("le patron general") to semiology (or semiotics) (Sebeok 2002: 168)

M	
Map	Representation, usually on a plane surface, a terrestrial region

	(Sebeok 2002: 192)
Mental image	The mental plan of something (shape, sound etc.) (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Metonymy	Using an entity in order to hint to another entity related to it (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Message	The messages can be built up on the basis of isolated signs or, most often, as a combination of signs (Sebeok 2002: 164)
Mimesis	Intentional production of shapes in a simulative manner; intentional (voluntary) simulation (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Mode	Manner which a shape is coded in (visual, auditive etc.) (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Model	Imagined or exteriorized shape (through a physical environment) in order to keep the place of an object, event, sentiment etc. (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Motor program	An autonomous circuit capable of coordinating the movement of diverse muscles in order to accomplish a task (Sebeok 2002: 195)
My language	My language is the total sum of my own being, for the man is the thinking (Sebeok 2002: 58)
Myth	Any story or narration aiming to explain the origin of something (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Mythology	The study of myths (Sebeok 2002: 194)

N	
Name	Shape identifying a human being or, through connotative extension, an animal, an object (as there would be a commercial product) or an event (as there would be a hurricane) (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Namors	When the signification of a sign allows only one denotate, it is called as singular. The singular signs, including the proper names, they belong to a mode of identification called namors by Morris (1971: 76 and the followings): "which are linguistical symbols". The namors are members of the same family of signs, called "identifiers", to which belongs two subcategories: the indicators, namely the non-linguistical pair of the namors; and the descriptors,, namely the "identifiers describing a position" (Sebeok 2002: 85)
Narration	Something told or written, as a report, a story (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Narrator	The person telling the narration (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Natural environments	Natural means of communication, like there would be the voice (the speaking), the face (the expressions), and the body (gesticulation, posture etc.) (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Natural shape	Shape produced by nature (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Novell	Fictional narration in prose, of an appreciable length, typically having an intrigue unfolded through the actions, the speaking, and the reflections of the characters (Sebeok 2002: 195)

O	
Onomatope	Verbal iconicity (pic-pic, boom etc.) (Sebeok 2002: 194)

Onomastic	Studying the names (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Opposition	Operation which the shapes are differentiated through, by minimally changing their signifiers (Sebeok 2002: 195)
Osmosis	Spontaneous production of a simulative shape as reaction to a stimulus or to a certain need (Sebeok 2002: 195)

P	
Paradigmatic structure	The initial sound of each pair is different and sufficient in order to indicate a difference in reference. This differentiating trait of the signs it is known as paradigmatic structure – namely the relation which a certain minimal trait from within a sign it is sufficient through, in order to maintain it differentiated from all the other signs of the same kind (Sebeok 2002: 26)
Paradigmicallity	Differentiator property of the shapes (Sebeok 2002: 195)
Personal deixis	Operation of hinting to the relations existing amongst the participants to a situation (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Phoneme	Minimal unity of sound in a language, allowing the users to differentiate the significations of the words (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Primary model	Simulative shape (icon) (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Primary modulation system	Instinctive ability of shaping the sensitive properties of the things (namely the properties which can be felt) (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Programmed learning	The ability of a species of learning only those things relevant for its vital needs (Sebeok 2002: 193)
Proxemic Code	The distance between participants (Nida 2004: 50)
Phylogenesis	The development of all the semiotic abilities (iconicity, symbolism, language etc.) at the human species (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Phyto-semiotics	Semiotic at plants (Sebeok 2002: 192)

R	
Referent	Object, event, sentiment, idea etc. represented through a shape (Sebeok 2002: 195)
Referential domain	Objects, events, sentiments, ideas etc. class, represented by a shape (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Regulator	Gesticulation regulating the speech of an interlocutor: ex.: the hand movements indicating you to circulate, to slow down etc. (Sebeok 2002: 195)
Representation	Operation which a shape is attribute through, to a certain referent (Sebeok 2002: 195)

S	

Secondary model	Extension of a physical shape or of the signification of a simulacre or of an indexical shape (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Secondary modulation system	A system taking in account the indication or the extension of the shapes (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Secondness	Ability to hint to object through indication or verbal reference (Sebeok 2002: 195)
Semic cognitive style (triggering)	An indication giving the animals the possibility or recognizing a critical referent when they meet it for the first time (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Semion	Semion = sign (Gr.) (Sebeok 2002: 68)
Semiosis	The capacity of a species of producing and understanding the specific types of models it needs for processing and coding in a own manner the perceptual input (Sebeok 2002: 195)
Semiotics	Semiotics = semiology = signology (Fr.) (Sebeok 2002: 69)
	Doctrine of the signs (Sebeok 2002: 195)
	Semiotics = science occupying itself with the general study of the signs and of the signs systems; a largely spread orientation in the contemporary theoretical thinking studying the phenomena and especially the cultural facts as systems of signification and processes of communication (www.Dex.ro)
Semiotic composition of the signs	Signs' composition: the sign consists of three dimensions: (1) the physical component of the sign itself (ex.: the sound composing the word *cat*); (2) the referent which the sign draws the attention upon (a certain category of feline mammals); and (3) the signification evoked by the sign (the interpreted!) (what the referent transmits from psychological or social point of view). These three dimensions are simultaneous to each other (Sebeok 2002: 24)
Shape	Mental image or external representation of something (Sebeok 2002: 192)
Shaping	Innate ability of producing shapes in order to represent objects, events, sentiments, actions, situations, and ideas, perceived as having a signification of their own, a certain purpose or a certain useful function (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Shaping principle	Principle arguing that the representation is de facto a shaping operation (Sebeok 2002: 195)
Sign	Something staying in the place of something else (Sebeok 2002: 195)
	A sign is any physical shape imagined or exteriorized (through a certain physical means) in order to keep the place of an object, of an event, or of a sentiment etc. called referent, or of a class of similar objects, events, sentiments etc. called as referential domain (Sebeok 2002: 24)

	In the human life the signs accomplish several functions. The sign allow the people to recognize patterns in things (Sebeok 2002: 24) The definition the sign was given by Saussure with, it has opened the way which the semiotic investigation has been engaged in the first half of the XX Century. Saussure defined the sign as: (1)a shape composed of something physical – sounds, letters, gestures etc. – and this was called by him as the signifier; and (2) of the image or the concept which the signifier hints to – and this was called by Saussure as the signified (Sebeok 2002: 24)
Signal	A sign which, in a natural or in a conventional (artificial) manner, it triggers a reaction from a receptor (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Significance	We use this concept (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 69) in order to designate the cultural ambience which the pertinent signification of an enounce/text is actualized in, or of a work, namely the setting in relation of the decontextualized signification with the interests of the sign's producer and those of the message's receptor, so that the intentional structure produced by author/emitter to be noticed in the whole its complexity and globality (Lungu-Badea 2003: 86)
Signifier	Part of a sign that makes the hinting (the shape) (Sebeok 2002: 196) The material phenomenon, the material representation of the sign (the acoustic or visual image of the word from dictionary) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 85)
Signified	Part of a sign which the hinting is done to (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Signification	Individual concept highlighted by a specific representational shape (and) Relation established between a shape and its referent (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Signs (species of signs) (signs' classification)	Sem (semem), symptom, index, icon, symbol, name (Sebeok 2002: 64)
Simulacre	A simulated shape (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Spatial deixis	Operation of hinting to the spatial positions of the referents (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Speaking	Expressed language (Sebeok 2002: 197)
Specific codes	The signs forming the composition of the texts which belongs to some specific codes. These signs can be defined as signs maintained in cohesion by paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. The language is at its turn a code for having paradigmatic properties (pin vs. bin) and syntagmatic (plan, but not pfan) Obviously, a text has no signification except the receptor of that text knows the code / the codes on the basis of which that text has been

	built up, and only if the text hints to, occurs in, and it determines a certain specific context. (Sebeok 2002: 26)
Structuralism	An approach in semiotics considering the signs as some reflexes of the intellectual and emotional structures within the human psychism (Sebeok 2002: 197)
Structure	Any repeatable or predictable aspect of the models (Sebeok 2002: 197)
Subordinated concept	A concept necessary for subordinated purposes. (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Supra-ordinated concept	A concept with a high generality referential function (Sebeok 2002: 191)

Symbol	The majority of the semioticians agree that the symbolicity it is the factor that singularizes the human representation in report with the one of all the other species, allowing the human species to reflect upon the world outside the stimulus-reaction type of situations. By and large, the words are symbolic signs. But any specificam (Lat.) – object, sound, image etc. – it can be symbolic. An image in the shape of the cross it can stay in the place of the concept of "Christendom"; a V sign can symbolically stay in the place of the concept of "victory"; the white is a color that can symbolize the "cleanness", the "purity", or the "innocence", while the black can symbolizes the "uncleanness", the "impurity", or the "decay" (Sebeok 2002: 29)
	A sign lacking either the similarity of the contiguity, and having only a conventional connection between its signified and denotated, and with an intentional class for its designated, it is called symbol. The trait "conventional connection" – that "attributed character" defined by Peirce – it is introduced, of course, in order to distinguish the symbol both from the iconic sign and from index, while the "intension" trait is necessary in order to distinguish the symbol from the name (Sebeok 2002: 80)
	According to the psychologist Kantor (1936: 63): "the term symbol is used to keep the place of anything that is called by the psychologist as stimulus". Subspecies of symbols – having a semiotic importance that has rarely been correctly analyzed – have more or less entered the common use, at least in the contemporary English language. Such subordinated terms, with increased intension, they include: the allegory, the urge, the trademark, the logo (in heraldic), the emblem, the insignia, the mark, and the stigma. (Sebeok 2002: 82)
	Leslie White (1940: 454) wrote: "The human behavior is a symbolic behavior; the symbolic behavior is the human behavior. The symbol is the mankind's universe… the key towards this world and the means to participate to this world are the symbol itself" (Sebeok 2002: 181)
	Bronowski (1967: 376): "one could believe that, because only the human beings think by using arbitrary symbols, the people remain the only ones speaking with the help of the symbols. Again, though, the things aren't like this." (Sebeok 2002: 196)
	A sign staying arbitrarily or conventionally in the place of its referent (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Symbolicity	The operation of representing the referents with symbolic shapes (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Symbolism	Symbolic signification generally (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Symptom	A natural sign alerting an organism about the presence of some

	modified state in its body (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Synchronicity	It refers to the fact that the shapes are built up in a given moment of the time and for an individual purpose or function (Sebeok 2002: 196
Syndrome	A configuration of symptoms with a fixed denotated (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Syntagmacy	Combinatory property of the shapes (Sebeok 2002: 196)
Syntax	Syntagmatic structure in language (Sebeok 2002: 196)

T	
Temporal deixis	Operation of hinting to the temporal relations existing between things and events (Sebeok 2002: 191)
Tertiary model	A shape invented symbolically (Sebeok 2002: 194)
Tertiary modulation system	A shaping system upholding the strongly abstract shaping based on symbols (Sebeok 2002: 196
Text	A coagulated something, in order to represent complex (non-unitary) referents (Sebeok 2002: 197)
Theory of shaping systems	A theory affirming the presence of some special-specific shaping systems allowing a species to produce the shapes it needs in order to understand the world in an own manner (Sebeok 2002: 197)
Thirdness	An abstract form of knowledge (Sebeok 2002: 197)
Transmission	Sending and receiving the messages (Sebeok 2002: 197)

U	
Umwelt	A domain which a species is capable of shaping (the exterior world of the experience which a species has access to) (Sebeok 2002: 197)

V	
Varieties of signs	In addition to the six species of signs described here, we have hinted to a great variety of other signs, namely to: the banner, the allegory, the descriptor, the logo, the diagram, the insignia, the effigy, the emblem, the identifier, the image indicator, the mark, the trademark, the metaphor, the namors, the identity plate, the signature, the syndrome, and the stigma (Sebeok 2002: 88).

Z	
Zero signs	The zero signs in diverse signs systems, especially in language, a semiotic vehicle can sometimes – when the contextual conditions are adequate – to signify its absence itself, namely to present itself in the zero shape. The linguists who use the expression "zero sign" (phoneme, morpheme, or allomorph etc.) they are compelled to understand either "semnificam zero", or, ever much rarer,

	"semnificat zero", but never both case in the same time; taken literally, the notion of "zero sign" would be oxymoronic. (About using the zero in linguistics, see Jakobson 1940, 1966; Frei 1950; Godel 1953; Haas 1957) The role of the zero semic vehicles in other communicational systems than the verbal one, it has never been adequately analyzed. Pohl (1968:34-5), for instance, he erroneously affirmed that the civilian clothing functions as zero when worn in a context of uniforms, but thus it is confounded the opposition marked / unmarked to the opposition accomplished / zero (the anonymity, the ellipse etc.). The zero semic vehicles can be meet also in animals' communicational systems. Thus, Ardrey (1970: 75) argues that "the battle cry of the elephant is its silence" and, also, according to Rene-Guy Busnel, the information if vehiculated by the temporal parameter form the message exchanged by two member of the species Laniarius erythogaster, namely the "rhythmical structure of the silences…, and not the audible part of the signal itself" (Sebeok 1968: 138). But a more promising investigation from heuristic point of view it is suggested by the quasi-prosodic phenomenon, according to which, at several types of luminescent insects, the pulsatile interval is an element signifier element (Sebeok 2002: 62)
Zoo-semiosis	Semiosis at animals (Sebeok 2002: 197)
Zoo-semiotics	Studying the semiosis at animals (Sebeok 2002: 197)

Translation Studies

Abstractions	The abstractions represent a semantic class of meanings which do not constitute objects or events in themselves, but they are simply traits of the objects, of the events, and even traits belonging to other abstractions = tall, red, round, very, good (Nida 2004: 47)
Acceptability	It refers to the receiver and it represents one of the textuality's standards. It is in a reciprocity relation with the notion of intentionality: a cohesive and coherent text must be accepted as such in order to be used in the interactive process of the communication. In the applied linguistics, the notion of acceptability depends on diverse factors, of which the most important is the grammatical factor. There are diverse degrees of acceptability of a text or of a enunciation. In translation, the acceptability of the target text is determined by its grammaticality, by the integral restitution of the denotations of the source text in the target language, on semantic level, by the intelligibility of the target text which has to be, from esthetical point of view, between the quality of the adaptation and the quality of the translation (Lungu-Badea 2003: 47)
Acceptance	One of the significances of a polysemantic word (Lungu-Badea 2003: 14)
Adaptation	It is a strategy of translation which the subject have primacy in, and not the mode which these subjects are treated in. It is also a procedure of translation through which – on the purpose of making the target text intelligible and acceptable for the target public – it is replaced a social-cultural reality expressed in the source language with a reality specific to the social-cultural environment which the target language is being used in (Lungu-Badea 2003: 15) In a restricted meaning, the adaptation is the translation procedure corresponding to the functional equivalence, namely to the non-literal translation, consisting of replacing a social-cultural reality from the source language for a reality specific to the social-culture from the target language, in the cultural adaptation of the source text to the intention of the target culture (Bastin 1990: 215, 1993: 473-478)
Adding	Translation mistake consisting of introducing, in an unjustified manner, in the target text, of some superficial informational elements or of some stylistic element not present in the source text (Lungu Badea 2003: 16)
Adjusting the translation on the purpose of being achieving acceptability	It presupposes both taking in consideration the language factor and encouraging the free rendering in order to confer naturalness, and also of the culture factor, in order to provide a full understanding on this plan too. Then, from a wider perspective, the types of the texts which the translator operates with, are taken into consideration too,

	and, by and large, the readers expectations also (Nida 2004: 23)
Affective equivalence	Intuitive (Lungu-Badea, www.academia.edu)
Allusion	Syntagm of phrase which an idea is mentioned in, or is recalled a thought or an event, on the purpose of directly suggesting a similar event which it is connected with, which completes it… (…) The allusions can be historical, literary, mythological etc. and they refer to a common culture which the locutor and the interlocutor have. The implicit/explicit, the fragmentation of the reception, or even the reception's failing, they hugely depend on the cognitive capabilities of the receptor (Lungu-Badea 2004: 16)
Ambiguity	In what concerns the translation of the biblical texts, preserving the ambiguity from the source text it is recommended (Nida, Taber 1982: 7)
Amplification	It is a special transposition consisting of introducing a nominal or verbal syntagm in order to translate a sentence, a pronoun, or an interrogative adverb (Lungu-Badea 2003: 17)
Anachronic	Inappropriate to a certain period of time, to the ideas, to the cultural habits form that time, usually the present time; it contains a anachronism (www.Dex.ro)
Anachronic translation	The translator faces permanently the problem of establishing in what extent what it is implicit in the original text must become explicit in translation. If a translator details to much, the translation becomes somehow anachronistic, implying the fact that the original readers understood, noticed, and shared with the source's author some information types. One also make the opposite mistake, that one of omitting information that is absolutely necessary in order the readers of the translation to understand the text (Nida 2004: 43)
Anachronism	Mismatching or confusion between facts, event etc. and the epoque which they are placed in; an outdated fact, habit, or opinion (www.Dex.ro)
Analysis (fundamental procedure of translation)	It essentially consists of determining the meaning of the source text, but that "meaning" must be interpreted in its wider sense, of lexical, syntactical, and rhetorical signification. In other words both the content and the shape must be considered during the analysis (Nida 2004: 85) (…) the purpose of the analysis is that of revealing the deep structure of the text (Nida 2004: 86)
Anaphor	Anaphor is a linguistic unity interpretable only in relation with its antecedent (present in that phrase) allowing it to establish a relation with the referent; reiterating through a segment of the discourse another segment of the discourse; the anaphorical elements form the source language cannot be found identically in the target language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 18)
"Anatomic" translation	Done by linguists (Lungu-Badea 2003: 104)

Articulation	It is a translation procedure, but it is also a rhetorical procedure, revealing techniques of rendering consisting of expressing - with the help of the connection elements (coordination, subordination etc.) – the relations amongst the component parts of a text, on the purpose of highlighting their independence (Lungu-Badea 2003: 21)
Author	This term is used in order to indicate the producer (the emitter) of a text, of a discourse, or of an enunciation, which will be or not, submitted to a interlinguistic and cultural transfer. The author produces a text which vehiculates a meaning or several meanings, a message having a certain shape. Both the source author and the source text are determined by a series of linguistical and extra-linguistical factors which influence the sense's built up too (Lungu-Badea 2003: 21)
Automatic translation	The automatic translation is done by translation dedicated software. It shows the limits of the decontextualized translation and it highlights the importance of the human factor in achieving or at least in checking the result of the translation's operation (Moeschler, Reboule, 1999: 472, 482). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 104-105)

B	

Barbarism	Language mistake committed by a foreigner. It is a lexical error consisting of creating new words or of altering some existing words under the influence of a new language (Delisle 1993: 22) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 23) Mistake altering the form of the morphological unities, in opposition to the solecism (…) which is the more frequent encountered at the debutant translators (Lungu-Badea 2003: 23)
Backtranslation	It refers to verifying the translation of a target-enunciation by translating it back to the source language, in order to evaluate what measure can be found in, the essential traits of the source-enunciation (Larose 1989: 21-57) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 84)
Bilingualism	It refers to the individuals effectively speaking two languages, at least during a given time and, by using one of the two known languages, these individuals are letting themselves to be influenced by the other language which they know (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 96). There are several forms of bilingualism. The most usual is that of the collective bilingualism, defined as the linguistical situation which the speaker are determined to use alternatively in, depending on circumstances and on environment, two languages (Lungu-Badea 2003: 24)

C	

Calque	Translation procedure consisting in borrowing a word or a syntagm

	from the source language and translating literary its component elements (Lungu-Badea 2003: 26)
Cataphora	General principle of the enunciative linguistics, opposed to anaphor. It consists of announcing through a fragment of discourse, a cataphoric (replacer, substitutive) element, a part of the text following to be introduced (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 355) (Apud Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Categories of cultural terms	Nida elaborated since the year 1945 a classification – frequently reused later – of the cultural terms in five categories: ecology, material culture, social culture, religious culture, and linguistic culture (Nida 2004: 13, Introduction by Rodica Dimitriu)
Classes of words	The traditional categories of the classes of words are: substantives, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, pronouns, and particles (Nida 2004: 101)
Cliché	Formula, banalized expression by a current use (…). By and large, through a cliché it is designated a group of words, syntagms, expressions, often reiterated by locutors from other locutors and which gives the impression of a banal way of speaking. It imposes itself the distinction between cliché and verbal tic (a personal cliché), between clichés and the tandem words, of literary origin (periphrases of the classical poetry), or journalistic or advertisement nature (Lungu-Badea 2003: 30)
Closing technique for testing the translation	In order to evaluate a translation, one removes each fifth word out of a 250 words (or each tenth word), he reads the text with loud voice and he counts the wrong answers (Nida 2004: 18) One of the most exact texts measuring the degree of difficulty of a translation based on the so-called "closing technique", that measures the transitional probabilities. One can take , for instance, a text od 250 words, ant to eliminate each fifth word from it. The persons proceeding to the testing of that translation, they are asked to fill up the gaps with the words seeming them as being the most appropriate to the given text. The more answered words fit the original, the greater is the transitional probability and the easier is to read it (Nida 2004: 135)
Coherence	The relation between discourse and the real world of the object and of the phenomena (Nida 2004: 63)
Cognitive complements	Extralinguistic knowledge mobilized by the translator when searching for an equivalence (Krings 1986; Dancette 1998).These knowledge is constantly being added to the concepts already connected to some linguistic signs. The cognitive complement, essential for (re)constituting the meaning, it presupposes besides the information referring to the author and to the text's receptors, to the cognitive context, also those information referring to the cognitive context, to the extra-discursive presuppositions and to the pertinent thematic knowledge (Lungu-Badea 2003: 34)
Cognitive context	Cumulative information stored by translator as he reads and analyzes the target text and on which depends the understanding (Delisle 1993: 25). The importance of the cognitive context, also called as wide verbal context, for the univocity of the information, it equals

	the importance of the verbal context for the univocity of the words and of the semantic traits. The mnemic stock is being constituted during the understanding of a text and it corresponds to the detailed knowledge of short duration, to the meanings units formed during the reading and it is progressively integrated in the cognitive context, intervening in the understanding of the verbal successive sequences (Lungu-Badea 2003: 37)
Cognitive equivalence	Coming from the text's semantics and the notional complements brought by translator, based on real experience or not (Lungu-Badea, www.academia.edu)
Cognitive procedure of translation	Reflection operation consisting of establishing the interlinguistic equivalences. During this complex mental operation, the translator interprets, amongst other things, the source text, and he applies the pertinent translation procedures, he dissociates more or less consciously the languages, he explores the target language's sources, he chooses the expression means in the target language, and he verifies the pertinence of the chosen equivalences (Kleiber 1994, Krings 1986, 1988, Kleiber 1994, Dancette 1998) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 80)
Collocation	Syntagmatic association in an enunciation of two or more distinct lexical units, this sequency being used in the language with a certain regularity. The collocation is defined by Mounin (1955: 7) and Delisle (1993: 23) as a usual association between a lexical unity and other lexical unities, and by Ballard (2001: 108) as a privileged semantical relation amongst words belonging to diverse grammatical categories. Certain collocations become crystallized syntagms, idiomatic expressions, and clichés. The term collocation, firstly used by the English linguists, it has been used for a long time in France in order to designate the distribution of the lexical unities and not the associations amongst them. The collocations are defined by Cruse (1986: 37, 40) in opposition to the idiomatic expressions. The most quoted and the most present in dictionaries are the collocations formed by an adjective – substantive, because of being close to composing, but these aren't the only one neither are they the most representative for this phenomenon (Lungu-Badea 2003: 32)
Commented (annotated) translation	Also called as erudite translation (which can be free, literary, or interpretative), this type of translation is addressed to a specialty public and it treats the work as a study object. The commentaries accompanying the translation can be of linguistic, rhetoric, or encyclopedic nature, or they can be focused on the way of applying the translation procedures during the process of "producing" the target text. "The translation of the internal cultural distance" raises three big difficulties, related to the mode of apparition of the cultural elements in source text, to their cultural identity, and to their status in the source culture. In case that the information produced by the author it doesn't has available in the target language the necessary cognitive load, the perceiving can be burdened or it can even fail. The translation of the external cultural distance increases the difficulties of perceiving and rendering the message, because of the

	probability of not having, the target reader, a cognitive load equal to the one of the source reader (Cordonnier 1995, Richard 1998: 151-159). The translation mustn't attribute the reader qualities the reader doesn't have, and the translator mustn't think at a omniscient reader. All the theories referring to the impossibility of the translation were formulated in époques when the culture was the appanage of a privileged social class, who afforded themselves learning the official languages. The cultural distance to the work it hasn't been eliminated in the contemporary translations, but it rather has increased, becoming increasingly harder to be overcome, and reaching what J. P. Richard called as "translating the cultural ignorance", internal and external (:157).Thus, the translation isn't limited only to the text, but is considers the situation which, besides the personal extralinguistic and sub-context of the author, of the translator, and of the reader, they constitute basis factors collaborating to establishing the translatability of a text (Hurtado Albir 1990: 230, Delisle 1993: 47). The situation and the extralinguistic context are essential in studying the culturemes, which are in incidence relation with the connotations (Lungu-Badea 2003: 102)
Communication situation	Ensemble of non-linguistic elements specific to the context which the enunciations was produced in. During the interpretation stage the translator often has to reconstitute mentally the enunciation situation, to relate himself to the reality evoked by the enunciations from the source text (Lungu-Badea 2003: 89)
Communicational translation	Translation strategy taking in account the form and the message vehiculated by the source text, but also the author's style (Lungu-Badea 2003: 105)
Communicational approach of the translation	Considering the target text as message and considering the translator as communicator (Nida 2004: 15)
Communicative value of the translation	The translation's content and effect upon receiver (Nida 2004: 12)
Compensation	Translation rule consisting of reintroducing in another place in the target text an informational element / stylistic effect which was not possible to be presented in the same place like it was in the source text (Delisle 1993: 23). The compensatory virtues of a language vary depending on text, context, finality, and intention etc. (see also Kohn, 1983) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 32)
Complex and bidirectional system of negotiating the translations	The exceptional translations become a creator art, which reproduces and, in the same time, it transforms. In such cases the truth can be find both on discursive and aesthetical levels (Langer 1951), comprising all the denotative and connotative meanings. In order to analyze such translations it is necessary a complex and bidirectional system of negotiations: (1) with the source text, in order to determine its meaning, but also its secret of attractiveness; (2) with the receptors, in order to be able to start from their knowledge and

	from the adjacent presuppositions. For understanding this process, the most appropriate analogy is that with the "playing", as suggested by Wittgenstein (1953). The games consists both of rules and tactics, and in translations there are things which mustn't be done, but also ample spaces for creator tactics and for accomplishing something unexpected. These options cannot be ever formalized in rules, but they constitute the quintessence of what means a successful communication (Nida 2004: 167)
Composed bilingualism	The attitude of expressing correctly in a specially learnt language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 25)
Computer assisted translation	The translation performed by computer with the help of automatic translation software conceived by software writers especially on this purpose. This translation shows, for the moment, the limits of the unsupervised translation and the shortcomings of translating through decontextualized correspondences (Lungu-Badea 2003: 105)
Composed culturemes	Represented by syntagms and phraseological units constituted as units of meaning (Lungu-Badea 2003: 44)
Conceptual field	It refers to an extra-linguistical reality (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Concision	Writing technique also known under the name as concentration (Delisle 1993: 24), consisting of expressing an idea in the target language by using less words than in the source language, by eliminating the cumbersome expressions, the inutile repetitions, the pleonasms, or other stylistic shortcomings. It is, in essence, a fact of discourse (Lungu-Badea 2003, 34)
Connotative equivalence	Observing the style, the language register, the sociolect, the geographical spreading of the expression etc. (Lungu-Badea, www.academia.edu)
Consecutive bilingualism	The situation of the speaker who has consecutively achieved the linguistic and cultural competences, firstly in a language, and then in a second language (Lungu-Badea 2003. 25)
Constraint	The constraint it can be material, cultural, or extralinguistic, linguistic, and editorial, and it is a supplementary exigency imposed to the translator of some pragmatic texts taking in account a predetermined sector: bilingual forms, advertising messages, cartoons, catalogues, commercial labels, diverse inscriptions (Hurtado Albir 1990: 150-156) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 40)
Context	It has diverse significations: in order to indicate the linguistic neighborhood of a term or of an enunciation; in order to designate an ensemble of information available to the interlocutor, serving him for interpreting the discourse or the fragment of discourse take in consideration (Gruia 2014: 15) The context is the linguistic "entourage" specifying the signification of a lexical unit (Moeschler, Reboule, 1999: 127-132, 347-357) and it is indispensable for reconstituting the meaning through translation (Wen Chei, 1999: 144-153). It is also called as linguistic context, verbal context, or context, and it is formed by the words or phrases accompanying the word or the phase in cause. The immediate verbal

	context corresponds to the simultaneous presence of an ensemble of words in memory, and it explains thus why the polysemy of a word it is a state of language and it is not a fact of speaking. Outside context, any isolated word can present a number of virtual meanings, namely of significations, but no real meaning; once inserted in a context, the word's polysemy suddenly disappears and it is easily noticed the pertinent acceptation of the linguistic shapes thus assembled. (…) The context's function can be cognitive, denotative, referential, or stylistic (Lungu-Badea 2003: 36)
Contextualization	Placing the words in context in order to notice their exact meaning, it is called as contextualization (Moeschler, Reboule, 1999: 28, 87). So, one can speak about contextualization indices and about contextualization processes (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 99). The contextualization is defined as placing the word in context in order to understand them correctly. The contextualization indices – linguistic forms belonging to the linguistic repertoire of the speakers – signal the contextual presuppositions and they contribute thus to choosing the mode of interpreting the enunciations. The contextualization processes are various: (prosodic: rhythm, tempo, intonation etc.), non-verbal (mainly gestural), verbal (lexical, segmental, and sequential) and they show that the cultural differences are sometimes the result of the divergences caused by different use of the contextualization indices. Dynamic or contextual equivalence, the contextualization differs from transcoding (Lungu-Badea 2003: 40)
Contextualization processes	There are various contextualization processes: prosodic (Rhythm, tempo, intonation etc.), non-verbal (especially gestural), verbal (lexical, segmental, and sequential) and they show that the cultural differences are sometimes the result of the divergencies coming out of the way of using of the contextualization indices (Lungu-Badea 2003: 40)
Cooccurrence	The presence in a discourse of two or more distinct lexical units, consecutive or not, but forming a unity of signification (Delisle 1993: 25). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 41)
Coordinated bilingualism	It characterizes the situation of the bilingual speaker to whom the cultural universes of the two languages used by him are totally different from one another (Lungu-Badea 2003: 25)
Correspondence	The identity relation established outside the context between words, syntagms, or phrases, and which do not have except virtuality of meaning. (…) The correspondences are highly uses in teaching/learning the foreign languages, but also in the contrastive linguistics, in lexicology, and in terminology. The correspondence is aprioristically established between the linguistic elements, as in a bilingual dictionary, between the isolated elements (words, syntagms) or syntactic forms (L. Lederer, 1994: 50-51). In texts' translation, the correspondences between numbers and the technical terms are aprioristically given, while the other correspondences which can be detected by the contrastive study, they exist only retrospectively. The correspondence are established amongst

	linguistic elements, words, syntagms, and syntactic forms (...) It is the result of a transcoding operation (Lungu-Badea 2003: 42)
Countersense	Translation error consisting of attributing to a word / group of words, a wrong meaning, or, by and large, of betraying the author's thinking / intention by actualizing a signification contrary to that intended initially by the author (Delisle 1993: 25). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 40-41)
Cultural adaptation	Translation procedure replacing a cultural reality, a message, or a specific concept from the source language for one specific to the target language, when existing the risk of not being recognized by the supposed recipient of the translation (target public) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 15)
Culture	(The cultures) (…) are defined as the totality of the beliefs and practices of a society (Nida 2004: 162)
Cultureme	Word vehiculating cultural information, or the smallest unit vehiculating cultural information (Benko, 1985, 1989, Oskar, 1988, Vermeer li Witte, 1990, Chesterman, 1997, 2000, Lungu Badea, 2001, 2002, 2003). These cultural information, though implicitly being intended by the author, they do not remain without echo from the recipient in the source language. The author's and the recipient's acculturation to the same extralinguistic context it allows the recipient to notice the nuances of the author's ways of expression. In the case of the translation, the internal cultural distance is doubled by the external cultural distance, and the translator must decide if the untold things, by becoming told things – namely explicit -, do not mutilate the author's initial intention (Sandrini 2000: 219-231). When opting for explaining or commentary, one must have in mind the functionality of the translation and the cognitive capabilities of the beneficiary (social-political, moral-aesthetical, aesthetical connotations). Because of hinting to a extralinguistic context, to a situation, the culturemes can be historical, cultural, literary – unlike the connotations which actualize a meaning other than the lexical one, but in a determined linguistic context, the contextualized of decontextualized culturemes can have, sometimes, the same signification (Richet, 1993). They differ from quoted which are introduced in discourse and graphically marked with quotation marks; they can be individual, and therefore evoking literary or cultural deeds (they can belong to the author, to the translator, to the readers etc.) or they can be collective, and therefore known / presupposed as known to the interlocutor; or, they can belong to the cultural patrimony (in this case resembling to the metaphor). We can speak, also, about unchangeable culturemes which occur in lexicon and in message (Lungu-Badea 2003: 43)
Cultural translation	This type of translation consists of translating a text t so that all the elements bearer of cultural information, the culturemes, to find their explanation, within the target text or outside it. The cultural translation varies according to the type of source text. It can be done through glossing or annotation, but also by interpretation within the target text (especially in the media articles). We must keep in mind

that the cultural references act like a constraint. They compel the translator to naturalize the source text; and the cultural adaptation makes of translator the partisan of the ethnocentric translation (Lécrivain, 1998: 345-358). The communicative strategy (focused on recipient) "restores" the target-effect, but by using different translation means and cultural references, which annul the intention of the source culture, with everything it means. (…) Depending on the type of text and of its finality, the translation will choose the most adequate translation solutions, but a cultural translation presupposes a translation note which the cultural meaning and metaphor are applied in, which the expression used in the source/target languages was born in (Lungu-Badea 2003: 106-107)

D	
Decontextualization	The absence of the context or getting the word out of context, it has as result ambiguity, sometimes increasing the risk of misunderstanding (Lungu-Badea 2003: 44)
Denotative equivalence	Transmitting the information vehiculated by the source text about extralinguistic (Lungu-Badea, www.academia.edu)
Derivational field	The derivates of a linguistic sign (…) which are related to also the semantic values of the linguistic unities (Hjelmslev 1969: 78-82; Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 216). (Apud Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Deverbalization	The cognitive process of decoding / exceeding the linguistic signs, a process necessary for synthesizing the meaning (Hurtado Abir, 1990: 45-59, 229, Gile 1995: 91, 196). It is the second stage of the translation process, situated between the understanding of the text and the text's rendering in the target language, characterized by the dematerialization of the linguistic signs concomitantly to noticing the cognitive and affective meaning. The deverbalization is a cognitive process which the sensorial data become knowledge disrobed of their sensitive forms in. In the cognitive memory is born an ephemeral knowledge, restituting a deverbalized meaning, created out of words, but not confounded to those words. The deverbalization of the meaning units and of translation units, a non-verbal stage, a mental stage, it takes place on the last moment of the understanding and on the first moment of the reformulation, of the reconstitution, during the translation process. The second stage of the translation process, difficult to be noticed, because of being bases on cognitive processes taking place in the translator's mind during the translation act, it is studies also by the psycho-cognitive psychology and by ethno-translation-studies (Lungu-Badea 2003: 46)
Dialogical sequences	The dialogical sequences imply two or more units of the discourse, formally and semantically connected, for instance affirmations and

	negations, questions and answers, parallels, chiasms, new and old information, intertextual dependencies (parodies, allusions, quotes) and interna monologues. The last dialogical set is also the most uncertain, because of being, in many cases, formed fragile reports, of the type of those which the psychiatrists are paid to clarify them and the critics spend a life time trying to elucidate them (Nida 2004: 157)
Diglossic situation	Diglossia – linguistically – it is the coexistence, in the same country, of two different languages (one of the scholar and one of the common folks, or of two stage of the same language (www.Dex.ro)

Term mentioned by Eugene A. Nida 2004: 58. |
Dilution	Choosing a correspondent characterized by a superior number of signification than the one from the source language (Vinay, Darbelnet 1958: 7, Delisle 1993: 29). (…) The dilution isn't a translation procedure but a simple lexical correspondence between a simple element and a composed element. The different form of the sentences in different languages placed in translation relation it can lead to numerous dilutions (Lungu-Badea 2003: 48)
Discourse register	(from translation studies point of view)The hierarchical classification of the linguistic achievements taking in account the nature of the relations amongst the speaking-subjects, their cultural level, the approached themes, the chosen degree of standardization or familiarity. Each speaker simultaneously uses several registers. The main registers are; artistic, neat, current, familiar, popular, argotic (Vinay, Darbelnet 1958: 11, Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 268) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 82)
Discourse situation	It is called as discourse situation the ensemble of the circumstances which an enunciation (oral or written) takes place in. These circumstances are included in the physical and social frame which the enunciations is done in, the image the interlocutors have about it, their identity, the idea the interlocutors make on one another, and the events preceding the enunciation (especially the relations amongst interlocutors and the verbal antecedents which the enunciation is inserted in (cf. Moehler, Reboule 1999: 29). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 37)
Discourse's analysis	It studies the mechanical processes allowing to unveil the semantic organization of the extended texts (…). The translator must exceed the formal and literary appearance of the source text, so that to be able to divide it in syntagmatic elements (equivalence classes) or in simple logical propositions, as also in argumentative, narrative macrostructures etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 18)
Distinctive traits for structures of chain words	For any series of this kind there are three types of distinct traits: common, diagnostic, and supplementary (Nida 2004: 92)
Documentation	Stage belonging to the translator's work method, consisting of consulting the written sources (monographies, catalogues, dictionaries, encyclopedias etc.), electronic sources (data bases, terminology) in order to achieve the terminological / thematical

	knowledge necessary for translation (Delisle 1993: 29). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 48)
Dubbing	The ensemble of operations: of translation, interpreting, and recording, in order to render the sound of a movie (…) in a target language. The dubbing can be preceded by a translation-adaptation of the visual sequences, so that, in case of subtitling, to be rendered texts adequate from the point of view of the readability, framing to the screen, and restituting the dialogues. In case of sound dubbing (synchronization) the oral acting of the speakers it is preceded by the translation of the dialogues and by adapting these dialogues to the labial articulation of the actors from that movie (Lungu-Badea 2003: 49)

E	

Economy	Translation procedure taking in account the wording techniques, and consisting of concise rendering, focused on an enunciation from the source language, and using fewer words in the target language (Delisle 1993: 29) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 50)
Emic data (the tagmemics theory)	"Emic" comes from the abbreviation of "phonemic" (Nida 2004: 55)
Empathy	Term used in order to define the state of congeniality, intellectual and emotional affinity, existing between author (poet, novelist, dramaturg, essayist) and his translator, himself being a writer (…). The term *empathy* used in translation studies it has been take from Bahtin through Teodorov, and it defines – in literature and in the reception's aesthetics, the faculty of the capacity of the novelist to identify himself to his characters, in translations studies defines the capacity of the translator to identity himself to the author of the translated text (see also J.-L. Cordonier 1995) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 51)
Entropy	Loss inherent to the translation activity, degradation suffered by the information during the translation process form a language to another (Delisle 1993: 30) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 51)
Enunciation	The enunciation is the product of an emitter in the communication frame achieved in a given situation. It mustn't be confounded to the phrase (…); it has at least a conjugated verb. In enunciation it is important the reference (and not the signifier / signified dichotomy), namely the hinting to objects connected to the enunciation situation. The enunciation is also stabilized from cultural point of view depending on the psychic and cultural aptitudes of on the knowledge of the coparticipants in the enunciation process (Moeschler, Reboule 1999: 305-307). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 52) The spoken form of the discourse (Nida 2004: 63)

Equivalence	1. (general meaning) The relation of similarity between two meaning units in different languages and having the same or almost the same denotation and the same connotation.
	2. The result of the translation process.
	3. (narrow meaning) Translation procedure consisting of rendering a certain expression from the source language through a certain expression in the target language which, though different, it corresponds to the same reality. (…) The equivalences are established between texts integrated in a culture, in a communication situation, and which are perceived as products of the interaction between translator and text.
	There are several types of equivalences (Seleskovith, Lederer 1993: 25, Lederer 1994: 49-83, J. Delisle 1993: 28): cognitive (coming out of the text's semantics and the national complexes brought by translator, based on real experience or not) and affective, intuitive, at M. Lederer; denotative (transmitting the information vehicle by the source texts about extralinguistic), connotative (observing the style, the language register, the sociolect, the geographical spreading of the expressions etc.), standers or normed (conform to the genre of the translated text, advertising, handbook etc.), pragmatic, dynamic (…) adapted to the reader's knowledge in order to be understood)
	The term equivalence describes also the result of the translation process, establishing a relation of synonymity. In a narrow sense, the equivalence defined the translation procedure of rendering a defined expression from the source target by using another expression from the target language, expression which, though different, it corresponds to the same reality (Lungu-Badea, www.academia.edu)
Equivalent effect	In the case of the dynamic equivalence, through equivalent effect we understand the intention attributed to the source text, intention that must be rendered as faithfully as possible in the target text so that the effects produced especially on the physical plan (gestures, attitudes) to be analogue to the effects produced by the source text upon the source readers. Thus, an advertising incites (= manipulated) the recipient (= the consumer, the reader) to purchase the advertised product. According to this principle, the translation should produce upon its readers (target) an as close as possible effect to the effect produced by the source text upon the source readers. An illustrative example in this sense it is the translation of the instructions for use of diverse appliances, or the electoral propaganda etc. (see Reiss 2002: 42-43, 85-86, 108-109, 123; Newmark 1988: 48-49). (Lungu-Badea 2003)
	The equivalent effect is essential in translation studies being actually a desired result, but not the main purpose of the translation, for it is modified in the same time with the modification of the function of the target text or when there are big differences between the mentalities of the representatives of the source culture and of the target culture demonstrating that the simple translation wouldn't be enough (Lungu-Badea www.academia.edu)
Erudite translation	Similar to commented (annotated) translation.

Ethic data	(the tagmemics theory) "Etic" comes from the abbreviation of "phonetic". (Nida 2004: 55)
Ethnocentric translation (annexationist, naturalizing, targeted)	The term ethnocentric signifies, in this context, reducing or relating everything to the own culture, and that's why the ethnocentric translation (Berman 1985) or the annexationist translation (Meschonnic 1978), the naturalization or the "targeted" translation (Ladmiral 1986), all of them are searching for cultural equivalences. Bases on the primordiality of the meaning, the ethnocentric translation appreciates the translator language as being superior to the source language, everything that is foreign being naturalized, adapted, so that the source text to appear as being the fruit of the target text. The two principles of the ethnocentric translation are correlative to one another: 1) the foreign work must be translated so that the target reader not to realize that originally it was a foreign work; 2) the translation just be performed so that to create the impression that the source language is the one that originally created that text, namely it is what the original author would have written if he had known the target language. Consequently, the ethnocentric translation intends to erase any trace of source language, not to shock by using lexical or syntactical bizarreries. The major consequences of these two principles is the transformation of the translation in an operation which massively intervenes in, the literaryizing metawriting (Lungu-Badea 2003: 108)
Ethno-translation	Ethno-translation (Stefanik, 1995, 1999, 2000) it is a translation type and a translation attitude situated in the middle of the ethno-translation studies. Although it doesn't contests the generally accepted principles and clearly formulated by the translators' community, the ethno-translation is mainly based on the speculative presuppositions which can be had and, eventually, emitted by a person, in our case a translator (Lungu-Badea 2003: 52-53)
Ethno-translation studies	The ethno-translation studies (B. Stefanik, 2000: 26), based on the principles of the ethnology, it analyzes latent conceptions, interiorized and semi-conscious, translation prejudgments, preconceived idea on a still unknown and unpracticed phenomenon or activity and their effect upon translation itself (B. Stefanik, 1999: 76-100). The ethno-translation studies exploits the results from the ethnology, which are applied in translation too, and, especially in forming the translators (Stefanik 1996: 265-293) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 53)
Evaluation method for translation	The totality of the operations used by a translation studies researcher in order to evaluate the quality of the produced text relating / or not to the source text (M. Wandruska 1979: 298, Berman 1986: 88-106, Dussart 1998: 329-343, Larose 1998, Lungu Badea 2003: 116-148). The monolingual evaluation method, the comparative methods (the bilingual methods, the relating of a source text to a target text or to several target texts, worded in the same target language; the plurilingual method: comparing several target texts in diverse target languages, to the source text) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 71-72)
Explanation	Translation process consisting in introducing in the target text, for

	more clarity, of some specification unformulated in the source text, but which are expressed in the cognitive context / from the described situation (M: Țenchea 1994: 163-172, 2001: 59-77). (…) It is a strategy of solving a cultural or civilizational transfer (M: Lederer 1994: 126, B. Trandem 2001: 2), used when the borrow, the calque, or the equivalence cannot help us to actualize the significations intended by the author. The explicative periphrasis annihilates any trace of the signifier, keeping only the connotations characteristic to the signified (Moeschler, Reboule, 1999: 84, 86). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 54)
External translation	Between two languages (Lungu-Badea 2003: 102)
Extra-discourse presupposition	Extralinguistic or situational information usually considered as obtained or obvious to the source language speakers, and which is, consequently, inutile to express in the target language (Delisle 1993: 40). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 79)
Extralinguistic context	The extralinguistic context, cultural or general social-historical, it represents the ensemble of the events, codes, social reports etc. necessary for understanding an enunciation (Moeschler, Reboule, 1999: 29). The cultural or extralinguistic contexts are dominant for substantives, the linguistic contexts are dominant for verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. It is called as discourse situation the ensemble of the circumstances which an enunciation (oral or written) takes place in. This includes the physical and social frame which the enunciation takes place in, the image the interlocutors have of it, their identity, the idea which each one of them has it about another, and the event which preceded that enunciation (especially the relations amongst interlocutors and their previous verbal interactions which the enunciation is inserted in (cf. Moehler, Reboule 1999: 29. In this sense, we use at out turn, the syntagm extralinguistic context, which is indispensable in determining the "referent of the used expressions" and the internal characteristics actualized when a word is used, but also in order to express the syntactic and lexical ambiguities. The context's role is undeniable, in establishing the act of language accomplished and the normal r abnormal character of an enunciation; the context makes possible the interpretation of numerous expressions and structures whose meaning it is undecidable without relating it to an ensemble of knowledge (see also Lungu Badea 1999: 59-70). In order to designate the same reality are used the following terms: situation, situation context or situational context, in other words the frame which the discourse / the text is emitted in, and it comprises all the elements of the situation which the act of speaking takes place in (places, things, persons etc.). The situation or the extralinguistic context confers the discourse a sense, and it conditions its enunciation, and it can be analyzed in connection with four parameters: the object (what is in that message about); the emitter (the person who enunciates the words of the phrases); the receiver (the person whom the message is addressed to); the vector (the spatial and temporal conditions which the message is enunciated in)

	(Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 492). These parameters condition both the production and the reception of the message. The diverse factors conditioning the understanding of a message show that, in translation, we always deal with two types of meaning: that one which the isolated phrase is presented in, and that one presented by the enunciation when integrated in the verbal context, in the cognitive context, in the extralinguistic context, and in situation. In the first case, interpreting the enunciation it is being done depending on the general knowledge, but this understanding is only a hypothesis upon the meaning, and not a translation faithful to the original. In the second case, that one of the contextual integration, the understanding of the enunciation it is uphold by extralinguistic factors and it is effectuated by spontaneously excluding all the virtual and non-pertinent meanings. Consequently, a translator must take in account both the word's significations and the extralinguistic elements which condition the understanding (Lungu-Badea 2003: 37-38) Gestures, the closeness between interlocutors, the type of publication, publishing house etc. (Nida 2004: 14)
Extralinguistic message's elements	(the communicational approach of the translation)In the verbal communication these elements are: mimic, tenure, tension between interlocutors, the exchange of looks, or the closeness of the source to the receiver (Nida 2004: 42) In the verbal communication these elements are: the type of publication (book, newspaper, review), the quality of the printing, the type of paper or of cover (Nida 2004: 42-43)

F

Factor for decisions regarding the restructuring - referring to receivers	The decisions determined by the aimed readers have, at their turn, to take in consideration: (1) the educational level of the readers, (2) the interests and the motivation of the readers, and (3) the suppositions of the readers regarding the acceptability of a translation (Nida 2004: 123-124)
Factors for decisions regarding the restructuring	The decisions concerning the types of restructuring - necessary to produce an acceptable translation and with a great impact upon the readers – depend, especially, on three factors: (1) the intended receivers, (2) the type of text regarding the content and the style, and (3) the purpose which the text will be used on (Nida 2004: 120)
Factors influencing the communication (through translation)	Source, message, receptor, feedback, jamming, context, transmission means (Nida 2004: 16)
False analogies	The false analogies are words belonging to different languages but

	corresponding morphologically; their significations differ between the source language and the target language, because of evolving in different social-cultural contexts. Because these words resemble to one another in their forms, they can confuse the translator so that he attributes the signification which the word has it in the source language, in the target language. This fact can lead to attributing a contrary meaning, or even to nonsense (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958: 9; Gile 1995: 193) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 19)
False meaning	Translation mistake resulted out of an erroneous appreciation of the meaning of a word / enunciation in a given context (Delisle 1993: 31) (…) This type of error occurs in the case of translating the words having a common root, like the paronyms etc. (…) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 87-88)
Fidelity	The quality of a translation following as much as possible the supposed intuition of the author of the source text (it judges the exactness of the target text in comparison to the fund) and having its formulation in the target language according to the use and the stylistic of the target language (it evaluated that quality related to the form). The fidelity criteria vary depending on the translation strategies (liberal, literal) and on the texts' domain, genres, and functions. The fidelity's dimensions are: the subjectivity (the author's intention), the historicity (the culture's intension), the functionality (the reader's intention), implicitly the translator's intention). The fidelity is an extremely important aspect which must be taken it in account in the translation's theory and practice (A. Hurtado Albir 1990: 211, 218). The report between original and translation cannot be neglected, because of appreciating the translation only by relating it to the original, and not by comparing it to another translation (the comparative method with several target texts has specific objectives). Fidelity is a key notion in translation studies and it experiences a diversification of formula and acceptances (see also Mounin 1955, Zuber 1995): fidelity to the author's text, fidelity to source language but also to target language, fidelity to the recipient of the translation and the epoque of creation, fidelity to the author's intention etc. Any hierarchization of the priorities it proves to be aleatory. The translation is what the translator wants it to be. The analysis of the oscillations between the translation of the meaning and the translation of the letter, it highlights the fidelity as cornerstone of the translation theories. The translator is the subject of the aesthetical and literary canons of his epoque. But the translation must cross through destruction in order to find its salvation into another language, but it isn't about a total destruction because of preserving the essential, the specificity of the author's sayings. The fidelity must be judged depending on the finality of the source text and on the finality of the target text attributed by the translator consequently to diverse types of constraint which act upon him (see also Gile 1982: 34-36). Depending on the attributed finality, the translator chooses the strategy and the processes of translation pertinent to attaining the

	objective: manifesting fidelity to one of the instances mentions above (Lungu-Badea 2003: 55-56)
Finality	Concept designating the purpose staying at the basis of producing a certain text, discourse, or enunciation. Depending of the predominant type of text which the analyzed text corresponds to, for a text can have one (informative text) or more (argumentative text) finalities, the translator establishes his objectives (A. Hurtado Albir 1990: 212-219). In practice, by and large, and in the translation practice especially, establishing the finality comes out of establishing the relation between the communication situation (source) and the receiving situation (target), of identifying the communication intention of the author (Reiss and Vermeer 1984, Larose 1989, Nord 1993, Reiss 2002). In translating the non-literary texts the accent often falls on the understanding of the target text, the translator needing to distinguish amongst the real and false finalities, privileging the first ones. The finality of the source text it pays an essential role, besides the text, in choosing the translation strategy (Lungu-Badea 2003: 56)
First-glance translation	First-glance translation consists of orally rendering, in a normal rhythm of reading, a written text, without previously reading it (Gile 1995: 14). It is, so, a form of interpreting having as objective to convey the message vehiculated by the author in the source text, with maximum of semantic and communicative fidelity, because, unlike the oral discourse, the text is in front of the translator during the entire time of translation. The interpret-translator can choose the rhythm of rendering the information, so that the intonation to be equal during the entire performance, without pauses or hesitations (Lungu-Badea 2003: 110)
Formal classes of words	Substantives, verbs, adjectives, pronouns, conjunctions, adverbs etc. (Nida 2004: 154)
Free translation	1. Translation strategy consisting of getting away from the strict conformity with the letter (ad literam). Antonym = literal translation; synonym = adaptation. 2. This syntagms is used for characterizing translations which, though faithful, they contain omissions and additions, many re-arrangements of the ideas' order. The intervention of the translator is necessary when aiming the fidelity to the meaning, to the intention, and to the message. But, obviously, this intervention must be a limited one. In such translations, the translators add appreciations not existing in the source text and they nuance the works' and the author's intention. Too much subjectivity can be damaging to the original's interpretation, it can cause errors, despite noticing the author's intended effect (Hurtado Albir 1990: 230). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 110, 112)
Fundamental translation procedures	The fundamental translation procedures are: the analyze, the transfer, the restructuring, and the testing (Nida 2004: 85)

G

Generalization	Using a word from the source language that corresponds to several words in the target language (Nida 2004: 112-113)

H	
Historical culturemes	Evoking in diachrony, actualizing the relation between the emitter and his epoque (Lungu-Badea 2003: 44)
Historicity	This concept designates an aspect of the fidelity when translating the old texts (Hurtado Albir 1990: 149-175, Ballard 1992). In the case of the old texts both the translator and the researcher on translation studies, they use both the intra-lingual translation (actualizing the source text in the contemporary source language) and the intention of the source culture that determined the producing of the source text, namely the aesthetical tastes during the author's epoque, the taboos, and the specific ideological principles back then. The translation won't be restricted only to the state of the language contemporary to the translator, but it will be related also to a series of elements of extra-linguistic order, which represent equally numerous constraint in choosing the most adequate translation strategy for rendering the source text in the target language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 66)
Hyper-textual translation	Consisting of selecting a certain number of stylistic traits (for instance the Homeric epithet, the Flaubert's imperfect etc.) and producing a text which could belong to one of the authors who used the same stylistic figures. Namely, the translation must recognized and reproduce the stylistic system of the work he translates. The hyper-textuality relation connects a text A to a text B which is anterior to the text A. A text can imitate another text, it can mock it, it can pastiche it, paraphrase it, quote it, comment it, or it can mix all of these (Lungu-Badea 2003: 108)
Hyper-translation	Faulty translation principle consisting of choosing, systematically, amongst several translation possibilities, all of them acceptable, that one having the most far form from the original expression (Delisle 1993: 33) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 59)

I	

"Impressionist" translation	Done by writers (Lungu-Badea 2003: 104)
Ideal transfer unit	Probably the ideal transfer unit is the paragraph, for it usually constitutes a significative semantic unit (Nida 2004: 111)
Idiomatic expression	Expression, stable form, construction specific to a given language and which cannot be literarily translated in another language, because the meaning of an idiomatic expression cannot be deduces

	out of the analysis of the structure and the sense of the elements composing it (Lungu-Badea 2003: 54)
Idiomatic translation	Translation strategy consisting of introducing idiomatic expressions in the target text, though this is not justified, because in the source text there aren't idiomatic expressions (Glossaire de la théories interprétative de la traduction¸web) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 109)
Implicit information of the source text	What in the source text isn't said explicitly but it is impl8ied: the historical atmosphere, the political conjuncture, the specific cultural elements etc. (Nida 2004: 126)
Implicit	Part of the communication not explicitly mentioned in the message (B. Pottier, 1974: 324-325, trad. ns). Any enunciation has an explicit part and, eventually, an implicit part too. When existing an implicit that can be more substantial than the explicit, and for whose translation one must go beyond the simple signaling of an obvious, the translator must select the signs producing a certain reaction from the reader (Slama-Carr 2003: 99-108). Although related to linguistics, the implicit counts on extralinguistic too (Hutardo Albir 1990: 84-85) (Lungu-Badea 2003. 60-61)
Implicitness	Translation procedure consisting of not formulating in the target language the informational elements from the source language, these details coming out of the context, out of the described situation, or out of the extra-discursive presuppositions (Țenchea 2001: 59-77). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 61)
Impropriety	Language mistake consisting of using a word in countersense, namely of granting that word the exact opposite or contrary to the usance meaning (Delisle 1003: 34). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 61)
Inclusion relation (connection) between meanings	The inclusion connections imply diverse types of hierarchies. In the series poodle, dog, mammal, animal, the meaning of the word poodle is included in the dog category… and so on up to the animal. There could be established a taxonomical hierarchy with the most general meaning, which to include both mammal and amphibian (…) (Nida 2004: 93)
Indirect translation	The indirect translation is accomplished through the mediation of another language. Thus, the source text that serves as support of the translation it is, actually, a target text, a version of the origin text in a language known to the translator and which serves as intermediary (Lungu-Badea 2003: 109)
Individual bilingualism	The capacity a speaker has of speaking two languages (Lungu-Badea 2003: 25)
Informativeness	A textuality's characteristic referring to the information contained by a text, to the number of data, and to the informative character of that text (Lungu-Badea 2003: 61)
Intentionality	Notion referring to emitter, being in a reciprocity relation with the notion of acceptability, and presupposing that a cohesive and coherent text must be intentionally created in order to be possible to use it in the communication's interactive process (Lungu-Badea 2003: 62)
Intentionality	The relation between source and message, depending on what the

(function of the discourse)	effect upon receiver it is supposed to be (Nida 2004: 63)
Interference	One can speak about interference in the case of a bilingual speaker or of a translator who uses in the target language a phonetic, morphological, lexical, of syntactic trait, specific to the source language. The loan and the calque are often the result of the interferences, but they either are integrated to the system of a target language, or on the way to be integrated (Delisle 1993: 34, Gile 1995: 91, 97, 112-113). The interference is individual and involuntary. The interference is a translation mistake consisting of introducing in the target text of a fact of language characteristic to the source languages the interference can take place on all levels: morphological, lexical, syntactic, stylistic, cultural (Lungu-Badea 2003: 63)
Interlingual non-isomorphism	Although the translation searches for an equivalence between two languages, there are often encountered cases in which a concept from the source language it doesn't exist in the target language, or vice-versa. These semantic voids, called by Menachen Dagut (1981: 63) as interlingual non-isomorphism, they can be found in two forms. The linguistic void is encountered when the target language shares a concept with the source language, but it doesn't have that concept reduced to a sole and compressed identifier / signifier (or word). (…) The referential void is more complex, because of the absence of the concept itself in one of the two languages. So that this concept cannot be translated directly, but only using periphrastically and explained in detail. The ancient Stoics' word: ekklēsia, it is an example in this sense. For we cannot easily translate this word in English, we import the concept in the world of our thinking and we use this word in its transliterated form. There are numerous semantic voids between the Greek language of the texts of the New Testament and the modern English language, and such voids are systematically filled up by translators who aim to creates worshipping communities which to match the Christian ideologies specific to the translator (inclusive of sexes, exclusive of sexes etc.) (Eyl 2014: 315-339, 317-318)
Interlingual translation	Or the translation itself, is consists of interpreting the linguistic signs given in a language with the help of another language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 102)
Internal translation	Updating the code from an epoque to another inside the same language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 102; www.academia.edu)
Interpret	A qualified person providing oral translation, the interpretation of an oral discourse, or recorded, or of a written text destined to the oral communication (Seleskovitch and Lederer 1986, Gile 1995) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 63)
Interpretation	Any oral translation from a source language in another language, addressed to the auditors, it is called as interpretation. The oral translation of the discourse of a speaker or of the dialogue between two or amongst several persons, by an interpreter, it is of eight types: simultaneous interpretation (in cabin, with earphones), conference

	interpretation, ad-hoc interpretation, simultaneous interpretation by whispering at the ear of the recipient of the discourse, teleconference interpretation, mixt interpretation, and notarial interpretation (Selescovitch and Lederer 1986; Gile 1995; Lungu Badea 1997) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 64)
Interpretation: ad-hoc	Intermediating the understanding (…) based on oral translation, consecutive to participants' interventions to the discussion, but also by alternating the work languages (…) (Gile 1995: 12, 146). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 64)
Interpretation: consecutive	Oral translation of a discourse etc. done immediately after the discourse has taken place, sometimes based on taken notes (Gile 1995: 12).
Interpretation: simultaneous	Oral translation of a discourse etc. done quasi-simultaneously to the discourse unfolding, in cabin, at earphone (Gile 1995: 12, Lungu Badea, 1997) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 64)
Interpretative translation	It combines the translation with the paraphrase, constituting an auxiliary modality of accomplishing the historical and aesthetical studies (Lederer, 1994). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 109)
Intersection relation between meanings	The intersection relation between meanings approaches the so-called synonyms. In reality there do not exist absolute synonyms, namely there aren't two words having exactly the same denotations and connotations, but it is true that in some situations some terms can be replaced for others, so that their meanings intersect and there is reached a point which the differences seem to be neutralized on (Nida 2004: 92)
Inter-semiotic translation	Translation done through the mediation of the linguistic signs with the help of the non-linguistic lexemes systems (cf. R. Kakobson, 1963: 79) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 102)
Intertextuality	Intertextuality is a concept belonging to the modern criticism and describing the report existing between diverse texts which compose together and ensemble (www.Dex.ro) The theoretical concept of intertextuality (J. Kristeva 1969, Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 29), it covers several related domains (philology, text's linguistic, semiotics, poly-system's theory, and the literary criticism) and it related to diverse types of analysis and interpretation of the semantic and referential virtuality of a given text. The textual characteristic refers to the relations existent in a certain text and the other texts which the considered text has in common some characteristics with, and the factors permitting to the readers coming in contact with a new text to recognize the traits they have encountered in other texts (Lungu-Badea 2003: 65)
Interventions: objective	The objective interventions known also as "changes" are by and large based on text but also on context (Molina & Hurtado Albir 498-512). These objective interventions can lead to changes in lexicon, in structure, and even in meaning, between the original text and the target text (Gagnon). The objective interventions can be considered as "mandatory" because the translator, mostly of the times, he has not other choice. The same occur to adaptors relating

	to the spatial and temporal elements (Bastin 2014: 76)
Interventions: subjective	The subjective interventions depend on the context which the translator activates in and on his will, due to multiple motifs: historical, religious, political, or appurtenance to a social-cultural community. These interventions are deliberate. Objectively, nothing compels the translation to act like this. One must keep in mind the fact that some interventions are required by the client, by sponsor, by censor, and they can be regarded as subjective but not as deliberate too, since they are required or imposed by a third part. The same phenomenon occurs in case of subtitling (Bastin 2014: 76)
Intra-lingual translation	Inside a language, consisting of interpreting the linguistic signs through the mediation of other linguistic signs belonging to the same language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 101; www.academia.edu)

J

Jargon	Involuntary modification (differing from the voluntary modification in case of slang) brought to the language by a category of speakers. One can speak about the existence of several jargons specific to some social-professional categories: physicians, linguists, translators etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 68)
Justifier analysis	This type of analysis of the target text falls to the translator and it consists of verifying if the written phrases are understood in the target linguistic community which that text is addressed to, making sure, in the same time, that his version isn't marked by the forms and by the structure from the source language. Through this is verified the exactness of the chosen solution, namely the perfect rendering of the source enunciation. So, the linguistic control has as objective to correct the eventual mistakes identified in the target text so that to be finally validated. It is taken in account the linguistic form but also the ortho-syntax, the redactional and translational pertinence (the semantic fidelity), the terminological, phraseological, stylistic, and sociolect verification, and the contextual adequation (…) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 19)
Juxtaposition	Procedure used in wording, the juxtaposition consists of omitting the connection element which ensure the explicit articulation of the enunciation and joining the information carries elements, so that the articulation's logic becomes implicit (Vinay, Darbelnet 1958: 10, Delisle 1993: 34) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 68)

L

Lacuna	The lacuna or the lexical void designates the absence in the target language of a word, of situation existing in the source language. When coming across a lacuna, the translator can use diverse

	strategies: the loan, the calque, the compensation, the reformulation etc. (Delisle 1993: 35) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 69)
Language mistake	Error occurring in the target text that is determined by insufficiently knowing the grammar, the lexicon, or the orthography of the source language (Delisle, 1933:31). Amongst the most frequent language mistakes we can mention: barbarisms, solecisms, interferences, and improprieties. Error in the target text consequently to a wrong interpretation or to an erroneous understanding of a translation unit, of a segment from the source text. This type or error is manifested through: false meaning, countersense, nonsense, adding, false analogies, omission etc. (Delisle 1993: 31) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 58)
Lexeme	1) A word or a part of a word serving as minimal support for information; a lexical morpheme; 2) Basic unit of the vocabulary representing the association of one or several meanings; word; lexical unit (www.Dex.ro) Mentioned by Eugene A. Nida too (2004: 154)
Lexical calque	It is imitated the way which the foreign word is organized in (or the groups of words), usually derived or composed (Lungu-Badea 2003: 26)
Lexical field	Out of which is born the derivational field of a sign (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29) When the lexical units present, besides their common sign, a formal resemblance too (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Linguistic approach of the translation	The source and target texts are analyzed from linguistic point of view (Nida 2004: 15)
Linguistic competence	The general capacity of a speaker of expressing himself in a language (monolingual), in two languages (bilingual) or in several languages (multilingual) it is called linguistic competence (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 192-194, Moeschler, Reboule 25-28). The communicational competence and the performance constitute the component elements of the linguistic competence and they define the capacity of a speaker of understanding the source language and his quality of expressing himself in the target language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 33)
Linguistic context	The linguistic context (the verbal context, or the context) it is composed by the words and the phrases accompanying the word or the phrase in cause, the linguistic entourage actualizing the signification of a linguistic element, or the meaning (vid supra CONTEXT, cf. Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996). According to the principle of contextuality, the sentence's context is that one which the signs and the concepts gain a certain meaning, and they actualize a signification that becomes pertinent, or a certain conception. In case of complex sentences, besides the principle of the linguistic contextuality, it intervenes also the composition principle, according to which the meaning and the reference of these ones are depending on the component senses and references (Lungu-Badea 2003: 39)
Linguistic	Affixing, reduplicating, and changing the forms (Nida 2004: 54)

procedures of translation	
Linguistic sensitiveness	The quality is manifested at a translator through a sharp sense of the language, a sense achieved through reading great authors and by knowing the diverse genres of texts (Ballard 2001). This sensitiveness is mostly composed of intuition, judgment, good taste, capacity of noticing the nuances, and a correct knowledge regarding the "linguistic tolerance" of the speakers in the target language. By and large, this sensitiveness intervenes each time when one must employ and adaptation and especially when the original metaphors must be translated (Delisle 1993: 42) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 88.
Literal translation	1. General meaning) Translation strategy consisting of: translating word by word, translating the motivations, the first meaning, the syntactic calque, the transcoding (Hurtado Albir 1990, Ladmiral 1997, 1998). This translation strategy, used in the inter-linear translation for highlighting the structures of the source language, it privileges the language of the source text and not the meaning, because the signification, the motivation, the significance, they cannot be rendered word by word or phrase by phrase. The literal translation focuses upon shape, and not upon the message vehiculated by the source text, and it doesn't observe the wording conventions (syntax and grammar) of the target language. Synonym = word by word translation. 2. (narrow meaning) The literal translation, the literalness, or the literalism, it represents the necessary condition, but obviously not sufficient when used alone, of a good translation (Delisle 1993: 48). It is one of the modern translation's characteristics which, though beautiful stylistically, it lack the interferences and, in the same time, it is faithful semantically (namely literal from morphological point of view) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 111)
Literary translation	The literal translation or the translation of the literary texts, including poetry, it makes the scheme of a written communication even more complex (Hurtado Albir 1990, Cordonier 1995). This translation type is based on intellectual and emotional affinity between author and translator (…) The target text take in account both the universe and the intention of the source culture, the translator being in the same time reader and author, or co-author of the translated text (Wuilmart 1998: 383-395). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 111-112)
Loan	The loan isn't usually considered as a translation procedure, but it is a modality or enriching a certain language; it becomes a translation procedure when a word doesn't have a correspondent / equivalent in the target source (Th. Hristea 1984: 41-65). As translation procedure (Delisle 1993: 29), the loan consists of integrating in the target text a word (expression) belonging to the source language, either because the target language doesn't have an equivalent or for rhetoric reasons (…) As product of the bilingualism / of knowing a foreign language, the loan constitutes a fundamental aspect of the contact between languages. It is an objective fact, a consequence of linguistic order

	of some extra-linguistic factors (as: the geographical neighborhood, the mixing of populations, the cohabitation, relations: of political genre, economic, cultural). The loan is adapted to the phonetic and morphological systems of the target language. It enters the target language on direct (oral) way – the unmediated contact between populations speaking different languages – or on indirect way (cult, bookish, through the mediation of the books, of the writing by and large) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 67)
Logical equivalence	It designates the report between two enunciations being true or false together (Lungu-Badea, www.academia.edu)
Loss	See entropy (Lungu-Badea 2003: 78)

M	

Macro-structure of the texts	The level of the progression and of the cohesion (called by Roman rhetoricians as exposition) (Nida 2004: 71)
Meaning	The oral synthesis of the understanding process construed up starting from the pertinent significations of the words (in context) enriched with cognitive complements. (…) Figurative meaning, derived signification form the first acceptation of the word which presupposes a semantic transfer form concrete to abstract, from animate to inanimate (ex.: the way of success(, and proper meaning, the first signification of the polysemantic word, the other acceptations being derived from the main one. (…) The enunciation situation, of producing the discourse, it is an essential parameter in understanding and reconstructing the meaning, for the meaning depends on the process of discourse's or enunciation's constructing, and the event representing the enunciation, at its turn, it is part of the itself meaning of the enunciation. Thus, studying the reports between linguistical signs and contexts, and the extralinguistic contexts, but also between the signs and their users, between the semantic field of a sign and its reference, it allows the actualization of the meaning in the whole relations complexity (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 193: 234-235. Hurtado Albir 1990: 230) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 86-87)
Meaning bearer units	The meaning bearer units are very diverse, from a groups of sounds to an entire book, like the symbolic novel is (Nida 2004: 89)
Meaning deviation	Localized deviation of meaning, of one affecting a phrase or an entire text. It can occur on diverse levels of analysis and in diverse places from text, especially in cases of entropy or compensation. The deviation or the sliding of meaning occurs more rarely in cases of transfer from a language level to another. The crossing from connotation to denotation and vice versa, it could be included in the same category (see also Ducrot and Schaeffer, 1996: 375, 422). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 46)
Message	Information conveyed by the ensemble of enunciations of the

	source text and which expresses what the authors wanted to day, to communicate to a recipient (Gile 1995: 120-121, Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 37) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 70)
Message's distinctive elements (the communicational approach of the translation)	There are three types of distinctive elements: verbal, paralinguistic, and extralinguistic (Nida: 2004: 42)
Metaphor (from translation studies' point of view)	The metaphor is a deviation of meaning using the similarity of the significations of the two associated elements which have at least a common lexeme; it replaces a signifier for another (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 378-379). Some metaphors are lexicalized and recognized from cultural point of view as clichés. Even having a similar context in two languages, this relation doesn't suppose an identity between the metaphors of the two languages (Lungu-Badea 2003: 70)
Methodological competence	The methodological competence (Vienner 1998) is defined as the translator's capacity of documenting himself upon a given subject and of assimilating the domain's specific terminology, based also on the technique of using the research instruments: diverse types of dictionaries, data bases, recording means etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 33)
Micro-structure of the texts	The level oi the diverse rhetorical procedures, as there would be: repetition, omission, changer in the receptors expectations, the measure of the units, the congruence (Nida 2004: 71)
Missing the technical term	Translating a term belonging to a special technical term in the common language (Lungu-Badea 2003. 45)
Mixt lexical-phraseological calque	It copies by literal translation both the structure of a phraseological entity and of one of its components (Lungu-Badea 2003: 27).
Modulation	Translation procedure consisting of changing a point of view, of a taxonomy, or a thinking category, relating to the expression in the source language (Chuquet, Paillard, 1989). The modulation can be: lexical or syntactical (fixe, lexicalized, recorded in dictionaries) or free (when the target language doesn't allow the literal translation). The modulation isn't added to the referential value, but it is part of the referential value. (…) The modulation is a perspective change upon the thinking units, upon the semantic units; it can be mandatory or facultative (Lungu-Badea 2003: 72-73)
Morphological calque and syntactical calque	These calques are rare and they consist of imitating a foreign procedure or a foreign grammatical construction (Lungu-Badea 2003: 27)
Morphosemantic field	When the lexical units present, besides their common sign, a formal resemblance too (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Most important universal characteristic of the languages	The most important universal characteristic of the languages is constituted by the major psychological and sociological functions which they accomplish (Nida 2004: 159)

N

Nominalization	It is a special type of transposition consisting of substantivizing other grammatical categories through translation (Lungu-Badea 2003: 74)
Nominalized meanings	Derived from verbs (Nida 2004: 97)
Nonsense	Translation mistake consisting of granting a segment from a source text a formulation totally lacking any sense or absurd in the target language (Delisle 1993: 37) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 74)
Notional semantic field	Ensemble of words being in a tight correlation of meaning (www.Dex.ro)

O

Omission	Translation mistake consisting of not translating, in an unjustified manner, a stylistic element or an element related to the meaning, from the source text (Delisle 1993: 38). To not be confounded to the justified omission / strategic omission; in such cases the translator compensated the deliberate loss in another place of the target text (Lungu-Badea 2003: 75)
Opposition relation between meanings - contrast	The most common opposition relations are the polarized ones, the reversive ones, and the reciprocal ones (Nida 2003: 94)
Opposition relation between meanings – polarized contrasts	The polarized contrasts are illustrated by the series: good / bad, fast / slow, rich / poor, tall / short. These contrastive sets belong, of course, to the same semantical field, but they do not differ in what concerns the positive or the negative poles (Nida 2004: 94)
Opposition relation between meaning – reciprocity	The reciprocity relations occur in the series to buy / to sell, to loan / to borrow, and to give / to receive. These pairs of meanings are closely related. The difference essentially consists of what we could call the direction of action. In reality, it is actually indicated the participant's change of perspective (Nida 2004: 94)
Opposition relation between meanings – reversive contrasts	The reversive contrasts occur in brief / debrief, tie / untie, and screw / unscrew. Many think that the suffix un- it is a negation, which is only partially true, for, in the case of the reversive untie doesn't mean not to tie, but it only means reversing the process of tying (Nida 2004: 94)
Original source (the communicational approach of the translation)	The person or the persons who initially elaborated the source text in the source language (Nida 2004: 42)
Orthology	It represents the multitude of representations which an individual can have about a reality, and amongst which only one counts,

40

	justified or not, but certainly for being available or more familiar to him than all the representations, and it actually being conceived by this individual (Chevalier, Delport 1995) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 76)
Orthonomy	It represents the immediate adequation of each word to its referent which it calls it depending on its properties or on the process which it is comprised in (Chevalier, Duport 1995) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 76)
Orthosyhntax	It designates a certain order of the words considered as natural by emitter. (…) Tendencies of the translators are to change the verbs tenses, the passive and active constructions etc. Amongst the procedures involuntarily used by translators can be mentioned: the adding, the suppressions, the meaning deviations, the commentaries (Lungu-Badea 2003: 77)

P

Paradigmatic equivalence	The paradigmatic equivalence, achieved especially through transposition, it is based on / it presupposes a correspondence between the grammatical plans of the texts being in a translation relation, the source text and the target text. Establishing or manifesting this type of correspondence it allows the replacement – the substitution of some grammatical elements from the source text for others from the target text without the meaning of the enunciation vehiculated by the source text to be modified at all. In the specialty texts, characterized by registers, purely "non-polluted", for instance inf the legislative texts, the verb tenses can be distributed in another language correspondingly to the style and to the register of this type of texts. The transposition consists of changing the grammatical category. Inside a language, the possibility of transposing it depends on the language register (…) The transposition is very frequent in translation (Gile 1995: 76-77). (Lungu-Badea www.academia.edu)
Para-linguistic context	Tonality of the voice, the speed of the speaking, the pitch of the sounds, the specific accent, the way of arranging the words on the page etc. (Nida 2003: 14)
Paralinguistic message's elements	(the communicational approach of the translation)These elements are: the voice tone, the pitch of the sounds, the sound's volume, the specific accent, all of them signifying something different. In the written form of the communication there also are important paralinguistic traits, as there would be: the shape of the characters, the correctitude of the orthography, the distribution of the words on the page (this being a very important factor in the today's poetry) (Nida 2004: 42)
Paraphrase (from translation studies point of view)	Translation mistake resulting out of abusively using the periphrases, the adding, which burden the target text and aren't dictated by the rhetorical or stylistic exigencies (Delisle 1993: 39, Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 371). Through this procedure, the target text is much extended in comparison to the source text. This procedure is justified when

	there is no equivalent in the target language, and when there cannot be used a neologism etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 77)
Paratactic structures	Although, in many languages (other the Indo-European ones) there is the tendency of using the so-called paratactic structures, namely two potentially independent sentences place so that the logical relations to be clearly suggested but not openly marked (Nida 2004: 115)
Particularization	(as it has been shown, vid supra) to the English word cousin it correspond in Chinese language eight different terms, so that in this case English language generalizes, while the Chinese language particularizes (Nida 2004: 113)
Pedagogical translation	The pedagogical translation, grammatical, or theme, it is a method of learning a foreign language consisting of establishing the correspondences necessary to learning (Buisseret 1975, Demanuelli 1990, Grellet 1991, Forget 1994, Vienne 1998) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 112)
Periphrasis (from translation studies point of view)	1. Replacing a word for a group of words with identical meaning 2. Translation procedure consisting of reformulating an idea form the source text in the target text, by employing several words, this choice being determined by constraints imposed by meaning (connotations, repetitions to observe / to avoid etc.) (see also Delisle 1993: 39) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 78)
Perlocutionary effect	The perlocutionary effect designated any effect, response, or consequence, produced by a text upon a reader, from the simple understanding of that text to the internal reactions (joy, psychic sufferance) and to the external reactions (Lungu-Badea www.academia.edu) The effect of the communication – the perlocutionary effect, if we use the pragmatic language – (…) presupposes two aspects: the impact aspect, referring to the readers' reaction to the informative content, and the "attractivity" effect, namely the readers' answer to the aesthetical form of the language or to the discourse's relevance according to their necessities (Nida 2004: 16)
Phatic	Interpersonal using of the language (Nida 2004: 57)
Phraseological calque	Calque of a foreign expression / locution (Lungu-Badea 2003: 27)
Philological approach of the translation	In the philological approach of the translation the accent falls on comparing the source text to the target text (Nida 2004: 15, 37)
Physical jamming (the communicative approach of the translation)	The physical jamming plays at its turn a significative role in the oral communication because it can produce serious distortions to the language (Nida 2004: 43)
Plurilingualism	It characterizes the situation of the individuals effectively speaking several languages, at least for a certain time (Moeschler, Reboule 1994: 304) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 79)
Pragmatic / dynamic	The dynamic equivalence is based on the equivalent answer

equivalence	principle, differing from the equivalent effect. The equivalent effect, noticeable on the emotional, psychic plan, it designates the intention attributed to the source text and reproduces with maximum possible fidelity in the target text. The equivalent answer, situated on physical plan of the attitudes, it aims to produce the same gestures, positions, and attitudes. The author incites his readers. Unlike the functional equivalence, the dynamic equivalence is ethnocentric and naturalizing, and it doesn't aim to share the target readers the same mentalities, it is not exotic neither elitist (Berman, 1985 a, 1985 b), and it facilitates the understanding through cultural, grammatical, and lexical adaptation, a reference strategy in the communicative translation out of which the translator excludes any foreign interference by using the natural equivalent (Nida, 1969) (Lungu-Badea www.academia.edu)
Pragmatic translation	Evoking the speaking acts and their diverse materializations in the source and target languages (Lungu-Badea 2003: 104)
Primary formal traits	The primary formal traits presuppose changing the order, the emphatic repetitions, the measured units (for instance the poetic verse and the rhythmical units), including of some scenic strategic directions, condensing in order to accelerate the tempo, clever transitions in order to highlight connections, and even non-grammatical expressions in order to highlight the importance of what is being uttered (Nida 2004: 158)
Primary semantic traits	The primary semantic traits include the creative using of the figurative language, the parallelism and the inversion for comparison and contrast, puns for revealing hidden meanings, the intended ambiguity in order to stir up the interest, the irony for subtle criticism, the euphemisms in order to avoid offences, and the direct language for saying a thing and implying something else (Nida 2004: 158)
Professional translation	It has as objective to produce a performance in itself, and it requires the translator to understand the source text before starting to translate it, for the reason for each translation is to make the readers to understand. The objective of a professional translation is to convey the meaning of a text, and not the words and the phrases in abstract (D. Gouadec 1987, Joëlle Redouane, Glossaire: la traduction, web) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 102, 112)
Proximate source	(the communicational approach of the translation)The translator (Nida 2004: 42)
Pseudo-passive construction	Expression accentuating the role of the one who endures the experience (Nida 2004: 61)
Psychological jamming	(the communicative approach of the translation)The psychological jamming it is more important, signaling a lack of interest from the listener. The psychological jamming is relevant also in the case of the written communication, whose theme and mode of presentation can attract or disinterest the reader (Nida 2004: 43)

R

Reading	Stage of the translation process, the reading consists of integrally reading the text to be translated, in order to understand it (mental translation), of noticing the elements to be submitted to a detailed analysis which top provide the optimal conditions for a good translation (Seleskovitch, Lederer 1986, Hurtado Albir 1990, Demanuelli 1991) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 69)
Reception situation	The ensemble of non-linguistic specific target elements, which the target enunciation has been perceived in. In the stage of formulating the meaning vehiculated by the source enunciation the translator often must reconstitute mentally the source communication situation which the elements conditioning the construing of the meaning are activated in, to relate himself to the evoked reality so that to render, consequently, by answering the perceiving conditions, namely the conditions of producing a meaning (Lungu-Badea 2003: 89-90)
Recipient	Starting from the acceptation recorded by Ducrot and Schaeffer (1996: 470) for the word recipient, this term designates in translation studies the person whom the translation is addressed to. This one can be an identified individual (a correspondent) or a public more or less defined (…) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 45)
Referential classes (semantical)	Objects, events, abstractions, and relational (Nida 2004: 10) They aren't superimposed to the grammatical categories, even if: the objects = mainly substantives; the events = mainly verbs (dynamic and static), the abstractions = mainly adjectives and adverbs, and the relational – mainly prepositions and conjunctions (Nida 2004: 101)
Referential equivalence	The referential equivalence hints to the subject treated by the source text and by the target text; so, it refers to the same reality, that one specific to the source language and not to a reality possibly analogue to the described, treated, or presented reality, in the source text The referential equivalence is a modality for preserving the cultural and social diversity situated in a relation of adversity to the ethnocentric and naturalizing translation according to which the adaptation facilitates the access to meaning and in the virtue of this creed the realities from the source language are replaced for the realities known to the readers in the target language (Lungu-Badea www.academia.edu)
Reformulation	The reformulation is the third stage of the translation process. It consists of reconstruing the meaning in the target language, in restituting or re-expressing this meaning with the help of the means from the target language, the diverse expression modalities characteristic to the source language; the employed means are more or less resembling to the ones from the source language, but they are in conformity with the specific norms and wording conventions (Hurtado Albir 1990). Fulfilling this stage correctly it depends on

44

	the precision which the understanding stage it been accomplished with (Lungu-Badea 2003: 81-82)
Relational	The relational can be of different types: deictic, temporal, logical, conjunctive, and of location. Their main function is to connect the participants to communication, or the objects and the events together. In many languages these are called as prepositions or conjunctions (Nida 2004: 47)
Relations amongst lexical units	Are constructions of delimitative, propositional, and relational-axial order. It is essential to describe these fundamental types of combinatory meanings by using the semantic classes: objects, phenomena and states related to them, abstractions, and relational. For determining the combinatory meanings, the semantic class it is more important than the syntactic class (Nida 2004: 102)
Relations amongst the word's meanings	The relations amongst the words' meanings occur in the form of four quite well contoured structures: (a) chain, (b) intersection), (c) inclusion, and (d) opposition (Nida 2004: 92)
Relations presupposed by discourse functions	These relations are: intentionality, coherence, intertextuality, and effect (Nida 2004: 16)
Relations structure amongst the words' meanings	Such a words chain is illustrated by the string: to run, to walk, to hop, to skip, and to crawl. For any series of this kind there are three different types of distinct traits: common, diagnostical, and supplementary (Nida 2004: 92)
Relevance	A standard of the textuality which the degree of relevance or the situationality of a text it is evaluated through, depending on the contained information, on the purpose which the information is used on, and on the connection amongst the communication acts and the situation which they occur in (Lungu-Badea 2003: 82-83)
Repertory	Collection of linguistic units from a language / from a specialized sphere of the human activity (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 48) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 83)
Repetition (from translation studies point of view)	Through repetition are signaled the multiple occurrences in a phrase or in a paragraph, of the same word / of the same structure. The repetitions can be language mistakes of they can have stylistic value (Delisle 1993: 42) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 83)
Report	Operation in the cognitive process consisting of simply transferring from the source language of some informational elements (proper names, numbers, data, symbols, monosemic vocals etc.) without needing an interpretative analysis (Delisle 1993: 42) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 83)
Re-verbalization	Mental stage specific to the translation reformulation process of a message understood in the source language and rendered in a target language. The re-verbalization stays between understanding and reformulation. The re-verbalization intervenes after deverbalization and it consists of re-expressing the concepts presented by the signifiers from the source language, by using now target signifiers (Lederer, Seleskovitch, 1986). (Lungu-Badea 84)
Rhetoric	The rhetoric, instead, had the task of studying the use of the *language* in certain types of situations and with determined

finalities. It was occupying itself, for instance, with the diversity of the linguistic use relatedly to the object (the "theme" or the "subject") of the speaking, from here deriving the distinction between different styles, according to the analyzed object's quality and nature. Finally, the dialectics studied the employing of the *language-use* in the scientifical and philosophical debate, in other words, it occupied itself with the *language-use* as instrument in order to search for and to formulate the truth by debating certain texts and antitheses (Coșeriu 2000: 14)

The rhetoric was understood, instead, as study of the situational use of the *language*, namely as an ulterior determination of the use of the *language* through the mediation of a certain situation, by relating it to the elements of this situation. In principle, these three elements are: 1) the speakers and the people whom they address to; 2) the circumstances of the speaking or the situation which the speaking takes place in; 3) the object which they are talking about. All of these are taken in considerations in rhetoric too. Rightly so, the rhetoric directed its attention mainly towards the literary text, where occur specific reports. The author "speaks" to his readers or, as I'd say, to nobody (but this is a problem which I'm not treating here). The circumstances of the speaking, the situations which the speaking is concretized in, they are not given; what remains are only the diverse object which one can speak about. Due to this reason, the rhetoric, as it has been established through tradition, it has been having in its sight, almost, only the object of the speaking and it has been developing its categories also by relating to the object of the respective speaking. On the other hand, the rhetoric, as developed and presented in education until after the Middle Age, it is especially normative; they started from the idea of an abstract adequation of the texts to the objects of the speaking, certain means of expression being prescriptively subordinated to some ideal objects of the speaking (Coșeriu 2013: 30)

S	
Self-translation	It is the translation done by the author (the emitter) of the source text. (…) It constitutes a special study object of the traductology, like also the statute of the translation who, one supposes that, he is in continuous empathy with himself. Therefore, the immersion in the source cultural universe, in order to establish the reciprocity between the two instances producing the source and the target texts, it is no longer necessary in such a case (Lung-Badea 2003: 21-22)
Semantic equivalence	The semantic equivalence characterizes the report between the source text and the target text, when they have the same semantic or semiotic content (= signified). Because the semantic equivalence is situated on the words' level and not on the level of the paragraph or of the texts considered as ensemble, this equivalence is considered

	as a lexical correspondence and according to this, to one word from the source text and its semantic equivalent or to its lexical correspondent form the target text it corresponds the same semantic field. On the same axis we can situate also the transcoding (see Cristea 1981: 57-67), operation consisting of establishing the correspondences between two languages either on lexical level or on the level of isolated phrase (Ballard1992, 2001). This procedures I applied in the cases of the proper names which denote, in the case of the numbers, and of the arithmetical values by and large. It is also called as zero degree translation (Lungu-Badea www.academia.edu)
Semantic loss	It can occur during the translation process consequently to the natural degradation of the information's quality while passing from a language to another, or it can be a translation mistake due to translator, to his cognitive, linguistic, extralinguistic etc. knowledge (Gile 1995: 35, 136) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 78)
Semantic relations amongst words and groups of words	The particularization (or the narrowing) (…) represent only one of the five semantic relations established amongst words and groups of words in all languages. The others are: (1) the participation (the so-called case relations), (…), (2) the conjunction (or the coordination) (…), (3) the substitution (…) and (4) the relational axis (…) (Nida 2004: 156)
Semantic translation	Equating the phrases from the source and the target languages, different structurally, but hinting to the same profound semantic structure (Lungu-Badea 2003: 104) Translation strategy respecting the form and the message of the source text which are rendered in the target language, being in the same time observed the wording conventions in the target language, the syntax, and the grammar (Lungu-Badea 2003: 113)
Semantical classes of the languages	All the languages have four general semantical classes: entities (man, tree, girl, house, dog, hill, cliff, water), activities (to run, to walk, to think, to speak, to work to fall), traits and characteristics, both inherent and states (rapid, slow, good, dead, tired, two) and relations (in, between, ahead, because, when, after, what) (Nida 2004: 154)
Semotactic restrictions	Another congruence form it refers to the semotactic restrictions (also called as sub-categorizations). Calling a toile as washing room instead of washroom, it represents the combination of terms making sense, but without being the normal combination for the English language. One can understand the expression cubit shape, but the normal expression is the shape of a cube (Nida 2004: 78)
Significance	We use this concept (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 69) in order to designate the cultural ambient which the pertinent signification of an enunciation is actualized in, of that one belonging to an art work, namely putting in relation the decontextualized information with the interests of the producer and the interests of the message's receptor, so that the intentional structure produced by author / emitter to be noticed in the whole its complexity and globality (Lungu-Badea 2003: 86)

Signification	Linguistical concept used in translation studies too, in order to signify the non-contextualized acceptation of a polysemantic word. The significations belongs to the language and it represents the capacity of the signified of "meaning something", capacity not-actualized in discourse. The dictionaries record the decontextualized potential of the words, their significations, and their acceptations (Delisle 1993: 44, Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 69) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 86)
Simple culturemes	Represented by simple lexemes (common of proper names) or composes lexemes (Lungu-Badea 2003: 43)
Simultaneous bilingualism	The situation of the bilingual speaker who learns the two languages in the same period of his development and education (Lungu-Badea 2003: 25)
Situation	The situation represents the ensemble of the elements which a communication act takes place in (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 492). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 89)
Situations context	Situation context, or situations context, it is the frame which the discourse / the text is emitted in, and comprised all the situations' elements which the act of speaking takes place in (places, things, persons etc.) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 39)
Slang	The slang is a form of symbolistic idiolect, a language built upon the purpose of not being understood by people from outside the knowers circle, and it has its syntax, its etymology, it vocabulary, and its history, being a language of the subcultural with a monstruous metaphor (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 94) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 19)
Social-lemme	A discourse unit which a speaker manifests his appurtenance to a social category through. The social-linguistics discerns and studies the temporal, spatial, social, and contextual linguistic variations (St. Munteanu1995: 137-153). In the case of the literary works the language used by characters it contributes to characterizing them, to individualize them (1: 138). The social and temporal variations "are determined by the circumstance / concrete situation which the communication takes place in, individualized through the frame and the theme of the message, as also through the professional or hierarchical reports amongst interlocutors (:141) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 90)
Sociolect	It is a social variety of a language, used by an individual, in the communication process in a certain social-linguistic context; or: a social dialect (www.Dex.ro)
Solecism	Agrammatism or language mistake that doesn't observe the norms imposed by the syntax of a language in construing a phrase (Lungu-Badea 2003: 90-91)
Source language	The language which the source text – submitted to translation - is worded in (ST). The translated language; the origin language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 69)
Source public	Source recipient, the public whom the source text was intended to (or the text to be translated). The author might have intended to address himself to a certain public category (Lungu-Badea 2003: 80)
Source text	A text submitted to the translation process, worded in the source

	language according to the specific norms and working conventions from the source language. Origin text the text to be translated (Lungu-Badea 2003: 96)
Source text's quality	The primordial condition assuring the translation's quality it is determined by the rigor which the source text has been written with, and by its coherence and terminological homogeneousness. Amongst the quality parameters we are mentioning here: the semantic precision, the temporal precision, the logical coherence, the homogeneousness, the textual description, the actuality of the used language (eventually intra-lingual translation), the date which the source text appeared on, the date which the intra-lingual translation has been effected, the users parameters etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 28)
Stages of the translation process	The translation act consists of "identifying" the translator to the author. In order to be able to speak about translation as a process we must have in sight a source text, and author, a source language, and a maternal language, a target language, a real of hypothetical recipient of the target text, depending on which it is established the translation strategy. In order to prepare and to unroll the translation process in optimal conditions, the translator reads (1) the source text, once or for several times, this constituting a form of mental translation, in order to understand (2) the text to be translated (Forget 1994, Dancette 1998). Quasi-simultaneously to the understand there takes place also the deverbalization (3), both of them representing the second stage of the translation process having as purpose to reconstruct (4) a meaning depending of the translation parameters (Hurtado Albir 1990: 45-72, Durieux, 1995). (READING, UNDERSTANDING, DEVERBALIZING, RE-VERBALIZING, REFORMULATION) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 52)

The stages of the translation process are: ANALYZING and REDUCING the text TO SEMANTIC NUCLEI, TRANSFER, RESTRUCTURING, TESTING (Nida 2004: 18) |
Strategic omission	The strategic omission is justified, being determined by some material, linguistic, cultural etc. constraints. Through this omission the meaning isn't altered, and the translator compensates through another translation procedure, in another place, the losses caused out of objective reasons (Lungu Badea 2003: 75-76)
Structural translation	Equating the surface shapes (the significations) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 104)
Stylistic equivalence	The stylistic equivalence it is related to a functional connection between the stylistic elements of the source text and those of the target text, in order to obtain an expressive of affective identity between the source text and the target text, without the enunciation's meaning to suffer modifications. The style of the target text can vary according to the nature of the source text. In the juridical translation, the style of the target text must correspond to the juridical norms of the target culture and language (Lungu-Badea www.academia.edu)
Stylistic loss	The stylistic loss can occur during the translation process consequently to the natural degradation of the style's quality and of

	the idiolect when crossing from a language to another, or it can be a mistake due to translator (Gile 1995: 35, 136) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 78-79)
Sub-differentiated expressions	The English word cousin doesn't specify which of the eight types of relations it is about, as there is in the Chinese language, where it is specified if the cousin is form the mother's side or from the father's side, of if he is the son or the daughter of an uncle or of an ant. Even more, the approximative ages of the cousin it is also specified (Nida 2004: 112)
Subtitling	Through subtitling it is designated the ensemble of the written translation operations (in a target language) accompanying the sound (in a source language) of a movie (…). In the case of subtitling, the adaptation-translation of some of the visual sequences allows the achieving of texts adequate from the point of view of the readability, of the framing on the screen and of restituting the dialogues (Lungu-Badea 2003: 92)
Sub-translation	Translation mistake (Delisle 1993: 46) consisting of not introducing in the target text the compensations, the explanations, or the detailing which an idiomatic and conform to the source text's purpose translation, it would imply (Lungu-Badea 2004: 92-93)
Supra-translation	1. Translation mistake consisting of explicitly translating the source text's elements which the target language would keep them implicit. 2. Translation mistake consisting of seeing two translation units where actually is only one (Delisle 1993: 45) (Lungu-Badea 2003. 92-93)

T	
Target language	The language which a text is translated in, or the translator language the translation or the target text (TT) is worded in (Lungu-Badea 2003: 70)
	Target public Target recipient of the translation (of the translated text). The author's intention can suffer modifications due to the material or of another nature constraints, and the category aimed by the author's intention and the new category aimed by the translation can differ from one another (Lungu-Badea 2003: 81)
Target text	The text obtained consequently to translation. The finite product of the translation operation, called also as translated text or version, the target text is the translation rendered according to the norms of wording specific to the target language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 97)
Target text's quality	In order to ensure the target text's quality, the translator favors the source, the finality, the form and the recipient. The code of a good translation will always favor the utility (a function of the finality) of the fidelity, at least in what regards the translation of the pragmatic texts. Because a well translated target text means, in case of translating non-literary texts, a text which the adaptation has been

	done in, depending on the requirements and the expectations of the reader. Amongst the quality parameters we are mentioning here: the semantic precision, the temporal precision, the logical coherence, the textual description, the actuality of the language (eventually intra-lingual translation), the date which the source text appeared on, the date which the intra-lingual translation has been effected, the users parameters etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 28)
Technolect	It is the professional jargon characterized by lexical expressions having a scientific and technical character. The technolect is constituted of the language and terminology characteristic to an activity or to an undertaking (Lungu-Badea 2003: 93)
Testing	Through the testing process, the translation process completes its entire circuit. The text from the receptor language it is now compared to the text from the source language, not based on the syntactic correspondences but on the basis of the way which receptors groups of the source text and of the target text understand the original and the translated text in (Nida 2004: 85)
Text's cohesion	A fundamental factor conferring unity to the entire discourse, regardless the variety of its sequences (Nida 2004: 17)
	This terms defines the grammatical and lexical connections uniting the words of a phrase or the phrases of a text. The cohesion is established with the help of the surface formal traits, which interact with the basic semantical relations in order to constitute the text's unitary character (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 390) (Apud Lungu-Badea)
	The cohesion can be achieved in five different ways: reference, substitution, ellipse, coordination, and lexical cohesion (enumeration and reiteration). The cohesion is a linguistic notion and a characteristic of the textuality which is indispensable in translation studies. Sometimes the anaphors and the cataphoras confer the textual unity a negative aspect, because of considering that a enunciation starting with anaphors and ending with cataphoras wouldn't form a textual unit, with the condition of not being saturated with para-textual elements (ex.: the situational context). IN the case of the literary texts, disregarding these rules are even appreciated, so that one cannot speak about unique rules, but about rules internal to each text genre (Lungu-Badea 2003: 31)
Textual analysis	It represents a necessary phase of the translation, namely the pre-translation, and it consists of analyzing the source text in order to establish the type of text, the text's finality, and the text's presumptive recipient (Delisle 1980, Reiss 2002).
	Depending on the obtained answers, the translator establishes the translation strategy and procedures which he will transfer the initial author intention in the target language through, in order to produce a similar effect upon the recipient (Bantaş 1978: 341-346).

	There are external factors capable of modifying the finality of the target text, independently of the translator's intention (Hurtado Albir 1990) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 19)
Textuality	The ensemble of characteristics essential for attributed the status of a text: the cohesion (the connection amongst sentences), the coherence (the connection amongst affirmations), the intentionality (of the emitter, speaker or writer), the degree of acceptability (the way the receptor reacts in), the informative character (the purpose of text's enunciation), and the intertextuality (the similitudes to other texts) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 97)
Traducteme	The traducteme concept designates the minimal translation unit. The unity of translation, the traducteme, the trans-eme, the connotative, the unity of meaning or semantic, are synonyms used for indicating an act of interpretation and conceptualization distinct from the unit to be translated and the translated unit (Ballard, 1999: 30), with concrete references, identifiable in the source and target texts (Lungu Badea 2002).
Transcoding	The transcoding (Cristea 1981: 57-67) it is an operation consisting of establishing the correspondences between two languages, either on lexical level, or on the level of an individual phrase (Ballard 1992, 2001). This procedure is applied in case of the proper names which denote, of the numbers, and of the arithmetical values by and large, It is also called as zero degree translation (…) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 117)
Transfer	The transfer consists of transferring the movement from the source language in the target language. The process which somebody ceases thinking in a language and he thinks in another language it constitutes a mystery. The transfer takes place on this level, for the languages resemble to one another more in their depth structures than in their surface structures (Nida 2004: 85)
Transfer difficulties / the semantic structure	Relating to the semantic structure there are four main difficulties: (1) the fragmentation / the particularization and the generalization; (2) categories expressed through different structures; (3) the absence of some characteristics from the source language or from the target language; (4) symbolic values connected to objects of events (Nida 2004: 112)
	Translatability A characteristic designating the totality of the problems inherent to the quality of the target text, but also the availability of the source text to be translated without loss or distortion (Lungu-Badea 2003: 114)
Translation	Translation based on interpreting the linguistic signs with the help of the non-linguistic signs (cf. R. Jakobson 1963: 79) (Lungu-Badea www.academia.edu) Translation is a polysemantic word having the following significations: 1. The translation operation; 2. The result of the translation operation, the finite product; 3. The translation study itself; the translation and the analysis of the translation process and

of the produced text. The polysemy of the word *translation* and the numerous contexts that it appears in, associated to other words in order to form new syntagms having new meanings (…) all of these show that the translation's statute is complex (Serres, 1974). One can distinguish diverse manifestations of the translation activity and of its results: the written translation, differing from the simultaneous interpretation or from the consecutive interpretation or from first-glance translation; but there is also: the word by word translation, called literal translation, the structural translation of equating the surface shapes (the significations), the semantic translation or equating the phrases between the source and target languages, structurally different, but hinting to the same profound semantic structure, the pragmatic translation or the evocation of the speaking acts and of their materialization in diverse source and target languages, the professional translation, the "impressionist" (done by writers) and the "anatomic" (done by linguists) translations. This diversity of approaches could explain the difficulty faced by specialists when trying to briefly define the translation: art, science, or technique. Edmond Cary denies the translations' status as linguistic operation, while Vinay, Darbelnet, Delisle, Chuque, and Garnier consider the translation as naturally inscribe in the linguistics' code, as defined by Saussure and Bally, insisting upon the fact that the translation is a scientific operation and not an artisanal one; the translation is an exegesis and an application in the same time. Partial synonyms: adaptation, re-expressing, interpretation, paraphrase, theme, and version (Lungu-Badea 103-104)

Translation competence	The capacity of a speaker of understanding the source language and his quality of expressing himself in the target language (…) The translation competence consists of transferring the message and the meaning of a text produced in a source language in a target language, observing the rules of language use specific to the code of the target language. Thus it is defined the translator's competence of understanding the mode which the meaning is articulated in a source text, and of rendering that meaning without distorting it in the target language, by avoiding the interferences (Delisle 1993, Vienne, 1998). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 33)
Translation didactics	The translation didactics analyze the ensemble of means, principles, and methods of teaching the translation in order to form translators. On this purpose, the stages preceding the translation (the linguistic, cultural, and terminological preparation, the techniques or wording in the source language and in the target language, as also the balanced distribution of the attention depending on the extent of the stages composing the translation process, are a few of the approached elements in the process of forming the translators, so that they to reach the necessary translation competence as expected by the translation's recipient (Chuquet, 1990) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 48)
Translation mistakes'	Dancette (1998) established a typology of the translation mistakes

typology	depending on the level they occur on. Thus, on lexical level can occur translation mistakes determined by: 1) not knowing a more rarely used term or word (neologism, specialty term) (…); 2) ignoring an idiomatic expression and this leads to decomposing it in component elements; 3) not recognizing (nor knowing) the actualized signification of a polysemantic word; 4) false associations; 5) wrong interpretation of an ambiguous word; 6) confounding some terms belonging to the same semantic field; 7) confounding a lexicalized syntagm to a descriptive syntagm; 8) wrongly decoding a lexicalized syntagm out of which one term is eluded. The mistakes occurring on the morphological level are determined by other linguistic shortcomings: 1) confusions between gerund and adjective; 2) difficulties of reconstituting an ellipse referring to the previous phrase; 3) difficulties of decoding the complex lexemes; on syntactical level are recorded difficulties of: 1) syntactic noticing of the phrases and expressions; 2) of determining the limits of a lexeme; 3) identifying the grammatical category of a term (quite rarely, verbs to substantives); at textual level itself are noticed difficulties related to: 1) determining the weakly marked report between sentences; 2) difficulties of noticing the intra-textual references (especially in order to understand the headlines, because the headline is understood through a reference to a phrase fragment from the article's body itself) and intertextual (allusions to diverse texts, movies etc. which, at their turn, they can contain other cultural references, other puns, other allusions signified in a given context); the difficulty of establishing cohesive anaphorical and cataphoric connections and segments of phrases. On the pragmatic-linguistic level, Dancette identified difficulties related to: 1) the semantic of the enunciation (the individual character of using a certain language, the distance between subject and enunciation, the degree of transparence of the sentences and the tensions occurred between locutor and co-locutor; 2) understanding the intention that the author had by using some cliché expressions of locutions (the aphorism in a discourse, the culturally marked formulas, all of them being veiled allusions); 3) transferring the metaphors: 4) extralinguistic, historical, geographical knowledge, puns etc.; and 5) pragmatic knowledge (Lungu-Badea 2003: 97-98)
Translation principle	Natural law, of normative structure, applied to the translation operation and according to which there can be deducted the translation laws like: "There aren't translated words, but their meaning in a context" (Moeschler, Reboule 1999: 161) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 79)
Translation procedure	(or transfer procedure) it designates any modality deliberately used by the translator when reflecting upon the source text and searching for an equivalent. Exemples of translation procedures: transposition, modulation, equivalence, adaptation, compensation, explanation, implicit, amplification, concision etc. (Delisle 1980, 1993, Garnier 1985, Guillemin-Flescher 1993, Chuquet, Paillard 1989, Larose 1989, Vinay, Darbelnet 1958) (Nida 2004: 80)

Translation rule	Orients and guides the translator thinking while trying to formulate an impression. The rule derives from a principle and it is correctly manifested by applying a translation procedure (Delisle 1993: 40) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 82)
Translation situation	The ensemble of the translation procedures used by a translator on the purpose of transferring in the target language the meaning from the source text, but also the cultural atmosphere which this meaning was produced in, so that to incite the target reader to a similar reaction had by the source reader. (…) it refers to the theoretical plan of solving, of treating a purpose. Applying the strategy in practice becomes, though, under the influence of the external factors, of the circumstances (linguistic, extralinguistic, and implicit - Tatiana Slama-Cazacu 2000: 46), a tactic, namely the adaptation of the plans to the circumstances in place. (…) the translation strategy is produce by translator depending on the source text and the intended finality of the target text. In order to reach his objective, the translator optimizes his strategy or he combines it with other strategies. In order to identify the intention of the source text, he deverbalizes the source text, he understands it, and only after that he chooses his strategy. The translation's success depends on a double condition: distinguishing and distancing the proposed purpose form the achieved purpose. The strategy aims the choosing of the most appropriate procedures, means etc. of translation in order to transfer the source text's meaning. The translation strategy is influenced by many factors: the distance between the source text's producing and the perceiving in the target text, between the author's intention and the translator's intention (editor) etc. Type of translation strategies are: semantic strategy (focused on restituting the meaning), communicative strategy (focused on recipient), literal strategy (rather faithful to the letter from the source text, or to the linguistic transfer), interpretative strategy (dialogue, negotiation, led discussion), this being actually a modality of acting and of manipulating a discourse (Lungu-Badea 2003: 91-92)
Translation studies	(Translatology)Translation science (www.Dex.ro)

It represents a technology based on a series of scientific disciplines (Nida 2004: 62)

Methodical, systematic, and scientific study, of the inter-linguistic, written or verbal translation's phenomena. The name of the science studying the process of translation, the translation theory, the science of translation, of Translatology, it varies from a translation studies scientist to another, depending of the study objects and on the discipline's objectives: the translation theory (Pergnier 1980), the translation science, the translatology (Ladmiral Brian Harris), the translation art (Cary), the translation theory and practice (Mavrodin 1981), translation-sophy (T. Ionescu), science of noticing (M. Ballard, Jun Xu), praxeology (Ladmiral), reflecting upon translation (A. Berman) etc. There is also the distinction between the |

	translator's translatology (descriptive) and the translatology of the non-translators (normative, inductive, speculative, and scientific) The theoretical observations upon the translation phenomenon only started during the XX Century; but general observations upon the translation phenomenon have been done almost the entire human history. (Lungu-Badea 11-114)
Translation theory	The study of the principles specific to translation on the basis of some solid linguistic fundamentals, and from various perspectives of the human language's science, which to allow the understanding of the translation process, either to evaluate the translations' product. (Ladmiral 1979). For instance, the theory of the finality or of the functionality (…) Eng.: skopos theory (…) (Reiss Vermeer 1986, Nord 1993, Reiss 2002), the interpretative theory (Lederer, Seleskovitch, 1986), the translation's sociology (Gouanvic 1999), etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 94)
Translation through intermediary	It is translated a text from an exotic or unknown language, in another language, through the mediation of a language which the text submitted to translation it is already translated in; translating a translation (Lungu-Badea 2003: 102; www.academia.edu)
Translation's beneficiary	This term indicates the person asking for the translation – or the client – and characterized by some parameters as: the linguistic competences, the specialized language competences, the fidelity of the rendered text, the time allotted to the assimilation of the information in this type of text (Gouadec 1987: 114). The person who benefits of the translation, of the information vehiculated in the target text (Gile 1995: 149) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 24)
	Translation's problem Actually, what is being translated? Obviously, one cannot cross directly from a language to another on the languages' plan itself, by deluding ourselves that everything can be translated or must be translated "directly" from the grammar and the lexicon belonging to the language A in those ones belonging to the language B, being given the fact that what is being translated isn't ever simply the "language", but it is always a certain text. Or, when one studies the grammar and the lexicon of a foreign language, the comparison is done, in the best scenario, on the level of the languages and, by having only the results of this comparison, the translator face a problem which, obviously, he cannot solve it by using these instruments: the problem of establishing the correspondence between a text belonging to a language "x" and a text belonging to his own language (or vice versa). Let's, for instance, think at the so-called "idiomatic expressions", namely at the semantically "non-analyzable" expressions (which global value doesn't correspond to the sum of their elements) and which, consequently, are translated entirely, as texts or as fragments of texts (Coșeriu 2000: 234-235)

	In addition to that, the translator must know, not only what it is translated like, but also what represents what he has to translated and what, eventually, it is not translated (or, a contrary, what must be added) (Coșeriu 2000: 243-244)
	The translation's problem, as one can deduce it from these brief observations, it is, fundamentally, a problem of the text's linguistics: when we translate, we must ask ourselves what is like, and what one would say in the same situation in another language, or in another linguistic community, which are characterized by cultural traditions differing from ours (Coșeriu 2000: 244)
Translation's relevance	In order to have emotional impact there must be relevance to the receptor (Nida 2004: 167)
Translationese	Although to the ones translating from a foreign language in their maternal language the analysis of the source text's language seems to be more relevant than that of the target language, such a perspective can be deceiving. Not clearly knowing the structures from the own language can lead to what currently is called as "translationese", namely to the forced use of the own language according to the template of the foreign language. On the other hand, anybody translating from his maternal language in a foreign language they tend to think only at the structure of the foreign language and they neglect, again, their maternal language (…) The complete analysis of the source text and of its equivalent in the target language constitute an indispensable stage of the translation process (Nida 2004: 109-110)
Translations' typology	1. Thys typology is focused on the code and of the process: a) the intra-lingual translation (inside a given language consisting of interpreting the linguistic signs through the mediation of other signs belonging to the same language), the inter-lingual translation or the translation itself (it consists of interpreting the linguistic signs from a source language with linguistic signs from a target language); b) the intra-semiotic translation (mechanical translation based on interpreting the linguistic signs with the help of the non-linguistic sememe systems (cf. R. Kakobson 1963: 79); internal translation (re-actualizing the code from an epoque to another, inside the same language), external translation (between two languages), translation through intermediary (from a rare, exotic, unknown language through the mediation of a language which the object of the translation already exist). 2. The translations typology can start from appreciating the result, the finite product, sand it can comprise several types: adaptation-translation, commented translation, erudite translation, free translation, professional translation, with the following sub-types: keyword translation, abstract translation, audio recorded translation, integral translation, or selective translation (Hurtado Albir 1990: 230-231, Gouadec 1989) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 101-102)
Translator	The translator is an actor playing the role of the author, and intermediary ensuring the adaptation of the meanings, of the

	message of the source text written in another language than the translator's maternal language, through the mediation of the interlinguistic and cultural transfer, by proving linguistic, extralinguistic, and translation competence. His translation strategy is based on the intended recipient of the target text, in order to solve the problems raised by the source text, in his quality of reader, on the finality of the target text. The translator exploits his linguistic, extralinguistic, and translation knowledge, on the purpose of transferring in his maternal language a message vehiculated by a text / by a discourse in a language foreign to him, observing in the same time the specific wording conventions of the target language, but also the intentions belonging to the text's author, to the text, and to the source culture. The translation specializes himself in three essential qualities: 1) the linguistic competence, the practical and very nuanced knowledge of the work languages; 2) the cultural competence, a solid cultural and technical preparation, grace to which to quickly achieve the information specific to the treated subjects, to the adequate terminology, to the circumstances and to the modalities of solving the translation problems and difficulties; 3) the sense of internal value of a language, of the latent possibilities, and of the play of its variations. The translator isn't a protected professional name. Anyone can entitle himself as translator and that's why is preferable to employ specialized institutions / societies, which have strict selection criteria. The specialized translators are those translation professionals, who have achieved deep thematic and terminological knowledge in a certain domain (theology, finance, law etc.). The authorized translators are agreed by law courtyards and they benefit of an certification proving their status. Depending on the types of translation one can speak about specialized translators: literary translator or co-author, author-translator, translator who adapts, professional translator, specialty translator, erudite translator etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 102-103)
Translator's intention	The cognitive and emotional result which the translator produces upon his supposed reader. This result can be similar to that aimed by the author or it can be, involuntarily or not, modified by the translator, according to the receiving conditions of the target text (see also the hermeneutic translation at Steiner 1978) (Lungu-Badea 2003 62)
Translator's note	Information added by translator in the target text in order to provide an informational supplement deemed as indispensable for a good reception / understanding of the source text. Usually, these notes mark the translation's limits and they refer to words catalogues as "untranslatable", or to social-cultural or civilizational realities (Lungu-Badea 2003: 74-75)
Transliteration	Transposition, transcription from an alphabet to another of a written text, rendering the letters through their equivalents from the alphabet which the transcription is done in, without taking in account the eventual differences of phonetic order between the signs of the two alphabets (www.Dex.ro)

	In certain situations the target language can miss a trait contained in the source language, or vice versa. The proper names are probably the clearest discrepancies between languages. Consequently, through the transliteration process, they are, usually, borrowed. Through the transliteration process there can result a form making sense in the target language, but which is as inappropriate as possible for a name (Nida 2004: 113)
Transposition	Translation procedure consisting of establishing an equivalence by changing the grammatical category (Chuquet, Paillard 1989). Inside a language, the possibility to transpose, it depends on the language register (…), neat or standard expressing. The transposition in translation it is very frequent (Gile 1995: 76-77). (…) The amplifying and the nominalizing are two special types of transposition (Lungu-Badea 2003: 117-118)
Types of interlinguistic communication	The diverse types of interlinguistic communication depend, firstly, on two kind of distinctions. First one is focused on the oral or written communication, while the second one implies codes accompanying the discourse (Nida 2004: 81)
Types of oral interlinguistic communication	There are two types of interpretation related to the oral communication: the consecutive one, and the simultaneous one. In the case of the consecutive interpretation there is the possibility of providing more information than in the case of the simultaneous interpretation. Anyway, in both situations, what really counts it is the ad-hoc interpretation, which is substituted to the attentive study of the source text, followed by establishing, in time, the most appropriate natural equivalent for its translation (Nida 2004: 81)

U	

Understanding	Stage of the translation process, the understanding (Brauns 1981) it takes place quasi-simultaneously to the reading or after reading (Hurtado Albir 1990: 48-52; Gile 1995: 37/38). In order the understanding to take place, the translator employs a series of elements as: the situations context (representing the context which the source text was produced in, the source signification), the cognitive context, the verbal context, the social-verbal general or extra-linguistic context (Seleskovitch, Lederer 1986; Krings 1986; Hurtado Albir 1990) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 67-68)
Units' meanings	The units' meanings can be conventionally classified in designating meanings – usually called as "connotative meanings" -, and associative meanings – usually called as "denotative meanings" (Nida 2004: 89)
Universals from language	From semantic point of view can be distinguished: for all languages, the same referential classes, as they appear described in the *Translation of the meanings*. It is then about the presence of the onomatopes, of the syntactic universals, because the words aren't

	concentrated meanings but they are "areas of meanings, with uncertain borders, which intersect one another" (1996: 7). On the textual level of the discourse there are manifested common principles of organizing, as there are the primary elements of time, space, and class, and the one of secondary rank, consequence, and dialogic sequences. That's why it isn't surprising that the texts are frequently structured in resembling types or genres (Nida 2004: 20)

As the language cannot be separated from culture it reflects, here too, can be contoured a series of universals, like: expressing through language of the biological elementary needs, or the power relations, and of solidarity, or of the universal concept of equity, concretized in systems of retributions of rewards. In what concerns the behavior, the gestures, of using symbols in rituals, of creating myths or literary works, the American social-linguist ascertains that "everywhere are more cultural similitudes than differences" (1996: 19) (Nida 2004: 21) |
| Untranslatability | The untranslatability designates the particularity of a text of not being possible to translate that text because of existing numerous cultural particularities (referring to the cultural identity of the ideas and of the things), impossible to be restituted through a literary, interlinear etc. translation, without ending in countersense or in nonsense (Glossaire de la traduction, web). Through extension, it designated something that cannot be expressed or defined (…). Not to be confounded to what is not translated due to some reasons (Sergean 1998: 225-231) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 66) |

V	

| Version | Translation form a foreign (source) language in the maternal (target) language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 118) |

W	
Way of approaching the translation	Philologically, linguistically, communicatively, socially-semiotically (Nida 2004: 37)
(other) ways of interlinguistic and intercultural communication than translating a text	Subtitling, dubbing, interpreting (Nida 2004: 25)
Wording conventions	Ensemble of norms and rules governing the wording in a language, providing the text's cohesion and coherence, but also the observing of the language level or register (Moeschler, Reboule, 1999: 16, 47,

	57, 103). When there is a mix of registers, as result of the deliberate choice of the author, his intention must be rendered, as much as possible, in the target text (Lungu-Badea 2003: 41)

Discourse / Religious Discourse

Circumstantial context	Existential or referential context, marking the identity of the interlocutors, the physical situations, the place and the time of the discourse (Gruia 2014: 15)
Conventionalized vocabulary:	(...) beloved spiritual sons and daughters: (...) Christian brothers! (Gruia 2014: 54)
Discourse	The term *discourse* refers to any verbal communication, either written or spoken (Nida 2004: 63)
Discourse – arguments – deeds	The urge to deeds, which, sometime is issued by presenting examples from the celebrated saints' lives (Gruia 2014: 72-73)
Discourse – arguments – examples	Examples form the saints' lives; examples of some extreme situations; personal examples (Gruia 2014: 75-77)
Discourse – discursive strategies – persuasion	Through persuasion the audience adheres but without being convinced, by being forced to adhere to an idea through the discursive means belonging to subjectivity, others than those belonging strictly to rationality (Gruia 2014: 38-39)
Discourse – functions	The functions of the discourse must be discussed in conformity to four types of important relations: 1) the relation between source and message, depending on what the impact upon the receiver it is supposed to be (intentionality); 2) the relation between discourse and the real world of the objects and of the phenomena; 3) the relations between texts and other texts (intertextuality): and 4) the relation between discourse and receivers regarding the discourse's effect (impart and attractivity) (Nida 2004: 63)
Discourse – functions – impact and attractivity	The relation between discourse and the receivers concerning the discourse's effect (Nida 2004: 63)
Discourse – functions – intertextuality	The relations amongst discourse and other texts (Nida 2004: 63)
Discourse – parts of the discourse – authority	The authority of the person (or of the divinity), or of the Church, or of the sacred text, or of some authorities in the domain as there are: the saints, the apostles, the evangelists etc. (Gruia 2014: 62-63)

	The authority specific to the values, having the role of influencing the discursive relation with the audience, it has also values defining the dominant of the religious discourse: the faith, the humbleness, the forgiveness, the confessions, and the truth (Gruia 2014: 72-73)

The popular authority, highlighted by using some popular expressions existent in the respective culture's language, which actualize, in discourse, a common traditional background, harmonized to the one from the preacher's individual discourse (Gruia 2014: 72-73) |
Discourse – parts of the discourse – confirmation	Called also as argumentation, it is the moment of the proof, of consolidating the own arguments, accompanied by the rejection of the adversary's arguments. This supposes powerful ideas, clearly, neatly, and convincingly expressed, avoiding the repetitions and the demonstrations specifying obvious things, and insisting upon the hard, convincing proofs (Gruia 2014: 32)
Discourse – parts of the discourse – exordium	It is the introduction of the discourse, destined to attract the attention of the audience (captatio benevolence). The orator must ascertain what king of audience he is dealing with, and to make efforts in order to prepare the listeners for understanding his discourse (Gruia 2014: 31)
Discourse – parts of the discourse – narration	It represents the exposition of the facts in a clear, verisimilar, and interesting form (Gruia 2014: 31)
Discourse – parts of the discourse – peroration	Or epilogue, it represents, actually, the discourse part which the rhetorical work is being consummated in, In this last sequence are summarized the most important arguments used in confirmation, and it insists upon the affective dimension, relating to passions and morals. The exposition style must be an assertive one, inciting the auditor's passions through stylistic ornaments (Gruia 2014: 32)
Discourse - universal principle for organizing the discourse	Some universal principles for organizing the discourse constitute the frames, the schemes, or the scaffolding of the extensive enunciations. These frame-components consist of primary elements of: time, space, and class, and of secondary elements of: rank, consequences, and dialogical sequences. The secondary traits constitute extensions deriving from the first set (Nida 2004: 156)
Discourse elaboration – stages – actio	It refers to the way of uttering the discourse, to the uses techniques, and to the bodily eloquence. Here intervene elements of stylistic nature, as there are the adaptation of the gestures, the voice, the mimic, and the verbal flow, depending on the discursive genre (Gruia 2014: 33)
Discourse elaboration – stages – alocutio	It represents the aesthetical dimension of the discourse, referring to the ensemble of the discourse, and taking in consideration the style's art. The discourse's purpose isn't only to convince but also to please (Gruia 2014: 30)
Discourse	It represents the art of the composition, or of the syntagmatic

elaboration – stages – dispozitio	structuring of the discourse, which takes in account the rules of organizing the discursive material. It is the operation of ordering the ideas and the parts of a discourse (Gruia 2014: 30)
Discourse elaboration – stages – inventio	It represents the intellectual action of searching for, selecting, and finding the ideas and the arguments necessary to sustain and to consolidate the thesis or the cause proposed to the audience (Gruia 2014: 30)
Discourse elaboration – stages – memory	It hints to the methods used in memorizing the arguments. Once elaborated, the discourse must be memorized. The speaker must imprint in his memory a series of places or images which he aims to created through, some mental spaces, for the images recall some things during the discourse's producing, and: "the orator extracts them from the mental places the images he has localized in them" (Gruia 2014: 33)
Discourse: discursive strategies – the atmosphere effect	The orator must anticipate the atmosphere which he is about to enter, to anticipate the mood of the audience relating to the proposed theme (…) the discourse must emanate a credibility atmosphere, not to challenge the rationality's elementary norms (…) (Gruia 2014: 38)
Discourse: fundamental operations - justification	Which introduces the rhetorical problem of the arguments and (Gruia 2014: 40)
Discourse: fundamental operations - organizing	Which provides the discursive coherence and logics (Gruia 2014: 40)
Discourse: fundamental operations - schematization	Which is built through, the situation model or the micro-universe called schematization (Gruia 2014: 40)
Discursive genre – deliberative discourse	It has as object mostly the future. The orator tries to convince the audience to make a decision related to a situation that will occurs in the future. The orator advices the audience depending on the values of useful/damaging, the decision falling to the audience. This genre of discourse is persuasive by excellence, and it tries to determine the public or the audience to act accordingly. The orator's interests in on foreground, though, apparently, the discourse can be construed on the interests of the listeners. The presented reasonings are of inductive type, having as dominant mode of argumentation the example. The religious discourse asking the audience to observe the biblical commandments having as reward the eternal life, it belongs to this genre (Gruia 2014: 28)
Discursive genre – deliberative epidictic	It oscillates between functional and ornamental, having the present as basic temporality. This genre's purpose is to eulogize or to blame,

discourse	its criterion is the beauty and its dominant argumentation is the amplifying. We mention here the religious discourse clarifying to audience a problem related to a dogma or to morals, in which is eulogized the life of a saint etc. (sermon, teaching, homily) (Gruia 2014: 27)
Discursive genre – deliberative judiciary discourse	It has as temporality the past; it presents and opinion related to a situation that happened and it is now being presented to the judiciary bodies. The purpose of the judiciary genre is to accuse or to defend in front of a tribunal, on the criterion of what it is right. The reasoning type is usually the deductive one. We mention here only the pleading and the indictment (Gruia 2014: 29)
Ethos – discursive	Any discourse conceives its object in a dialogical mode; that's why we try to highlight the perlocutionary function of the religious discourse, for this one is constituted depending on the answer the interlocutor gives to the sentences declared by speaker. This dialogue isn't analyzed only from internal perspective (of the declaration) but also from an external perspective (through the participation request addressed to the receiver), being highlighted the idea of the intentional part (especially through the discourse's polyphony itself), as also on external level, speaking about the discursive ethos. We speak thus, about a cognitive selection, but also in order to accomplish the methodological selection, in order to organize the arguments (Gruia 2014: 110)
Ethos – preexistent	Besides the discursive ethos "construed in discourse throughs tyle and similitude, and by referring to the public", we can also speak about the preexistent ethos; the orator speaks to the audience with the authority he has been given by his position within Church (Gruia 2014: 110)
Homily – types of homilies	Exegetic homily; thematic homily (Gruia 2004: 138-158)
Interactional context	The form or the chaining of some language acts in a discursive form, a chaining connected to some language-use's mechanisms (Gruia 20014: 15)
Logical – psychological moments – addressing formula	The addressing formula is important in order to compose such a discourse, for it institutes the closeness relation between audience and the speaker, the equality in front of Divinity, but also the quality as teacher belonging to the priest (Gruia 2014: 55)
Logical – psychological moments – catechesis	The homiletic and catechetical literature mention seven logical-psychological moments specific to the sacred elocution, moments constituting the religious service's plan: the text, the addressing formula, the introduction or exordium, the annunciation of the theme, the division of the theme, the invocation, the treating of the theme, and the closing (Gruia 2014: 52)
Logical – psychological moments – closing	The discourse's closing (epilogue, peroration) is the part where the forte arguments are brought to the audience, and where the basic ideas of the sermon are concluded with the help of the affective nature means (Gruia 2014: 59)

Logical – psychological moments – introduction	Announcing the theme is done through a biblical text, especially in the case of a thematic sermon; this channels the audience's attention towards the subject to be debated (Gruia 2014: 56)
Logical – psychological moments – text	The text is represented by the biblical or patristic verses placed at the beginning of the sermon, expressing the essential or being only a connection with the discourse's theme (Gruia 2014: 52)
Logical – psychological moments – the text	The sermon's introduction is adapted to the nature of the subject to be treated, to the audience's state, and to the speech's purpose. Now the discourse is restricted to one or to a few sentences (without using too many divisions which can confuse and tire the audience) the ideas being chained one after another (Gruia 2014: 55)
Logical – psychological moments – theme's division and the invocation	The theme's division and the invocation are done depending on the social-cultural nature of the audience, and on the situation which the discourse is actualized in. Dividing the discourse in its component parts it is recommended especially in the case of the sermons having a high degree of abstraction (Gruia 2014: 57)
Logical – psychological moments – treating the theme	Treating the theme is that part of the discourse where the churchly orator exposes his ideas, his beliefs, and his religious convictions, in a systematic manner (Gruia 2014: 58)
Pathos – persuasive elements – subjective repetitions	The subjective repetitions are used in order to highlight: a strong faith, a doubtless faith (Gruia 2014: 119)
Pathos – persuasive elements – the blaming	The blaming: there it is put some pressure on people (Gruia 2014: 119)
Pathos – persuasive elements – the exclamative enunciations	To the exclamative enunciations it is associated the specific intonation (Gruia 2014: 117)
Pathos – persuasive elements – the narrative sequences	The narrative sequences are organized as accounts regarding some events, on the basis of the scriptural or liturgical texts; they frequently use the direct speech as modality of organizing the text, that confers the text the impression of authenticity, or reinvigorates the story (Gruia 2014: 119)
Presuppositional context	Constituted of everything presupposed by interlocutors, a sphere determined by their beliefs, expectations, and intentions (Gruia 2014. 15)
Prototype – of the argumentative sequence	The argumentative is in contact only with some knowledge trying to present the human experience with the help of the thinking operations (Gruia 2004: 21)

	This discourse type is based on the act of explanation, of making your point to somebody (Gruia 2004: 22)
Prototype – of the descriptive sequence	It is focused on asserting the enunciations of "condition" (Gruia 2004: 22)
Prototype – of the dialogical sequence	The dialogue means that the interlocutors' enunciations are reciprocally determined (Gruia 2004: 22)
Prototype – of the narrative sequence	It is focused on asserting the "to do" enunciation. To tell the tale it means "a succession of events"; in order to speak about a tale there must be a 'thematic unity", "transformed predicates", " a process", and "an explicit or implicit final evaluation" (Gruia 2004: 19-20)
Religious discourse – argumentative strategies	O classification of the argumentative strategies it proposes us to differentiate them in two categories, according to the level which they are articulated on: global-discursive argumentative strategies (explanation, description, narration) and punctual argumentative strategies (the rhetorical question, the polemical rejection, the rhetorical metaphor, techniques which can be considered as "argumentative triggers accomplishing the progress of the entire interactive discourse (Florin Olariu, *The Verbal Interaction, between Ritual and Strategy*, in "Philologic Jassyensia, year III, no. 2, 2007, pp. 105-136) (Gruia 2014: 77)
Religious discourse – description	The religious discourse it is characterized, in comparison to other types of speeches, through its conservative character, through a specific stylistic tradition which is synchronized to the liturgical language and act, and that's why it isn't so permissive regarding the innovation (Gruia 2014: 129).
Religious discourse – ethos, pathos, logos	Persuasion through discourse it is achieved by using rational arguments (logos) and emotional appeals (pathos, which is, usually, conventionalized); these two are completed by pathos, through which the priest legitimizes his discursive position and his authority (Gruia 2014: 109)
Religious discourse – global argumentative strategies	The explanation, the description, and the narration are intertwined within sermon, in order to confer the discourse an obvious argumentative force and in order to make certain information from within content to be accessible to the interlocutor (Gruia 2014: 77) The definitions: the synonyms' method, the analytical and synthetical methods, the argumentative method, the method of the contextual involvement (Gruia 2014: 78) The narrative interventions or the explicative interventions: the narrative is manifested in the religious discourse by using the parables and the examples (Gruia 2014: 78-81) The analogy as argumentative method: it becomes, sometimes, the

	scaffolding which the argumentative process is developed on; often the analogy is done between the characters of the biblical parables and the audience (Gruia 2014: 84).
Religious discourse – punctual argumentative strategies	The rhetorical question, the denial, the rhetorical silence, the tropes (Gruia 2014: 89-109).
Religious discourse – strategy	The strategy, as process, it presupposes the ensemble of all the rules which the speaker construes his speech according to, on the purpose of convincing the audience (Gruia 2004: 62)
Religious discourse – types of discourse	Not any religious speech, uttered no matter in what circumstance, it is called as sermon. Thus, the religious discourse uttered after Liturgy it is called as homily; the occasional speeches, uttered during the diverse religious services, of more extended dimensions and with an imposed character, they are called as paraeneses; The discourse uttered during the religious conferences and in the religious assemblies, outside the worshipping places, they have a scientific character and they stay at the intersection with the lay culture, and they can be uttered also by persons who don't belong to the churchly hierarchy (Gruia 2004: 137)
Religious discourse – types of discourse – funeral speech	Presenting in a luminous manner the life and the deeds of the deceased, it tries to install a less painful atmosphere; also, by launching the idea that the death is only a crossing to another world (Gruia 2004: 28)
Religious discourse – types of discourse – the panegyric	It is a demonstrative discourse praising the lives and the deeds of the saints, or of the important persons from within Church, the orator having the occasion of demonstrating that the Christian teaching can be put in practice, in concrete deeds (Gruia 2004: 28)
Religious discourse – types of discourse – the paraenesis	It is a simple form of sermon, of short dimensions, that presents a characters imposed by context, by moment, in order to answer the momentary needs of the audience (Gruia 2004: 28)
Religious discourse – types of discourse in the frame of the progression	Narrative, descriptive, expositive-explicative, or dialogue (Nida 2004. 17)
Situational / pragmatic context	A cultural publicized context (examples of situational contexts: a liturgical celebration, a public discussion amongst parliamentarians, a flirt, a referential dialogue etc.) (Gruia 2014: 15)

Rhetoric

Adage	Cogitation expressing, in a few words, moral or philosophical truths (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 11)
Adjunction	Substantial operation of adding units (graphemes, lexemes etc.) in opposition to the suppression operation (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 11)
Allegory	Artistic procedure substituting a literary meaning for another hidden meaning. It is some kind of enlarged metaphor operating a transfer from on the abstract plan of some deep meanings, on the figurative plan, of surface. The allegory compares the significations of the facts and of the events and not their external traits (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 14)
Alliteration	Repeating the same sound or the same group of sounds at the beginning or inside several successive words, on the purpose of suggesting a movement or of creating the effect of an imitative harmony (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 16)
Anacoluthon	Style figure consisting of interrupting the syntactic continuity in sentence of in phrase and continuing it with another construction (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 19)
Anadiplosis	Stylistic procedure in poetry or in prose, consisting of repeating the last part of a verse or of a phrase at the beginning of the following verse or phrase (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 21)
Analects	1. Collection of chosen parts from an author's work or from a people's literature, of an epoque etc. 2. Chrestomathy (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 23)
Anaphora	Style figure consisting of repeating the same word at the beginning of consecutive verses or phrases. Anaphorical are also the words, the syntagms, the phrases repeating the same previously expressed idea in order to strengthen its understanding (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 21)
Anapodoton	Variety of the anacoluthon which misses one of the two correlative elements of an alternative expression, or the respective element it replaced for an inappropriate word (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 24)
Anonymity	Style figure consisting of repeating a proper name, often of a person, through the appellative which it comes from (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 27)
Antanaclasis	1. Style figure consisting of repeating a word, used with diverse grammatical values 2. Repeating a word with a changed meaning (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 27)
Anticlimax	The opposition in the same phrase, with two gradations, one ascending and another descending. Climax it represents only the ascending evolution part of the event, or of the process etc. (Marin,

	Nedelciu 2004: 28)
Antimetabole	Repeating the same words in an inverse order, a fact that changes, usually, the meaning of the communication (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 29)
Antiperistasis	Rhetorical figure trying to prove that the incriminated act is actually correct (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 30)
Antithesis	Style figure baes on the opposition between two ideas, two words, two characters, two deeds, which highlight one another (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 32)
Antonomasia	Style figure considered by some authors as a variant of the metaphor, of the synecdoche, consisting of using a common name instead of a proper name, and vice versa (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 34)
Apheresis	1. Rhetorical figure rejecting what it is to be rejected, and enunciating what it is worthy to be memorized 2. Suppressing a sound or a syllable at the beginning of a word, without altering its meaning (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 13)
Aphorism	1. Judgment expressing in a concise manner an opinion regarding the life. 2. Enunciation suggesting a theoretical truth. Synonymous to the adage, to the apothegm, to the sentences, and to the cogitation, the aphorism condenses, even paradoxically, observations with generalizing value, justified through the personal experience of the facts (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 13)
Apocope	Style figure consisting of suppressing a sound, a syllable, or a group of syllables, from the end of a word, without being affected the word's meaning by this (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 35)
Aposiopesis	Style figure consisting of interrupting a sentence or a phrase because of the hurry or for the reader can understand by himself what is more to say (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 38)
Apostrophize	Stylistic procedure consisting of an abrupt interruption of an exposition in order the speaker to address himself to a person or to a thing (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 38)
Apothegm	1. Memorable aphoristic formulation, usually antique of resembling the greatness of the antique ones, of a famous character 2. Deep thinking expressed simply and lapidary (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 36)
Apposition	Style figure consisting of using a substantive with a value of epithet next to another substantive (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 38)
Appositional	Construction using the apposition (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 38)
Archaism	Word, construction, expression, which are outdated or which are no longer in use. It often appears in the historical works (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 39)
Aside	Short monologue, uttered by the author with a low voice, in order to express thus the fact that it is destined only to be heard by himself, and to be perceived only by the reader. In theater it is addressed to the spectators, without being heard by the other actors on stage (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 35)

Assonance	Perfect rhyme, resulting out of fitting or only of similarity of the last accentuated vowel, without being there also a matching between the consonants from the same syllable or according to its tonic accent (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 44)
Astrophic	Which doesn't form strophes (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 45)
Asyndeton	Suppressing the conjunctions, in a phrase, in order to give that phrase expressivity, dynamism (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 44)
Attraction	Deviation from the rule of the grammatical accord (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 46)
Calligram	Special mode of arranging the verses on the purpose of graphically representing the symbols or the suggestions in a poetry (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 72)
Catachresis	1. Metaphor which the word is abusively used in, beyond its strict meaning 2. Figure of style consisting of using a word metaphorically, in order to name a thing that has no its own name 3. The rhetors' catachresis consist of using a word existent in a language in order to name a new object or a new phenomenon, which haven't been yet named, and thus it is being created a new word (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 78)
Cause/effect	A procedure employed in elocution consisting of starting from cause to effect or vice versa, when developing the subject (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 79)
Changes in the receivers expectations (of tropes nature)	The changes in the receivers expectations constitute the third type of rhetorical figures, being the most complex and in the same time the most significative. They imply changes in the order of the elements, in the sentences' structure, and in the words' meanings on several levels (Nida 2004: 75)
Changes in the sentence's structure (of tropes nature)	A change in the sentence's structure (usually called as anacoluthon) it can be the simple result of a grammatical carelessness, but when appearing in the literary words this procedure is intendedly used, and it can reflect one of the following situations: (1) a great emotional involvement of the subject, making his thoughts to no longer be expressed in a perfect grammar, or (2) as a means for highlighting a certain trait of an enunciation by interrupting the continuity (Nida 2004: 76)
Changes in the words' structure (of tropes nature)	Modification in the words' meanings are related mainly to the relations between their own meanings and the figurative meanings, but also to the change in the communication intention. The first ones imply a certain awareness of the own meaning, even if the figurative meaning is obviously aimed (Nida 2004: 76)
Charientism	Style figure representing a subtle irony, characterized by the expressions' cleverness (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 83)
Chiasm	Stylistic procedure consisting of crisscross placing two pairs of words in order to form an antithesis. The words of the first part are symmetrically inversed in the second part, from where it results a crossed symmetry (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 83)
Collages	Artistical procedure consisting of composing a literary landscape by

	sticking together some heterogenous elements (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 92)
Colloquial	Style without the elegance of the literary language (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 96)
Commentary	Explaining a literary work, or the interpretation often done in marginal notes. Commentaries done by authors inside a literary work (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 98)
Comparison	Style figure consisting of bringing together two terms, on the purpose of revealing their resembling traits, being thus accomplished a greater clarity and expressivity of the language. The comparison doesn't represent a substitution of a term for another, as in the case of metaphor, but it consists of putting together two terms connected by: *as, so that, just like* etc. (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 99)
Concatenation	Style figure consisting of repeating a word from a member to the next member, so that are chained to one another (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 104)
Concision	Expressing shortly (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 104)
Conclusion	The last part of a discourse, also called as peroration (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 104)
Constructivism	Aesthetical orientation from the beginning of the XX Century, characterized by the tendency of bringing the art, as much as possible, close to the pathos of the industrial buildings. Rejecting any adornment unjustified from a motivational point on view, the constructivists pleaded for as accentuated as possible schematization, abstracting, mathematizing, and even mechanizing of the artistic language (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 108)
Contraries	Argument consisting of opposing two ideas, two facts, two things, in order to highlight, by contrast, the qualities and the defects of each one of them (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 109)
Correspondences	Analogies between diverse sensations, used especially by the symbolist poets (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 111)
Deprecation	Rhetorical figure which is implored through, the one whom we want to persuade. The deprecation's recipient can be the result of a personification operation done upon a thing, a phenomenon, a sentiment etc. (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 130)
Description	1. Presentation mode used in literature, consisting of describing the specific traits of a thing, of a phenomena, of an aspect from nature, real or imaginary. 2. Literary work of fragment of a literary work built up by using this procedure. The description can be; fantastic, humoristic, romantic, naturalistic, scientific, poetical, or rhetorical (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 133)
Diaphorase	Style figure consisting of repeating a word but with another signification (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 135)
Diatribe	Violent and malicious criticism (www.Dex.ro) Technique which the author openly predicts with, the audience's reactions; it represents an anticipative feed-back (Nida 2004: 42)

Dilemma	Reasoning comprising two contradictory premises which lead to the same conclusion (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 138)
Elision	1. Modification or disappearance of a sound from a word under the influence of another sound, identical or similar (from within that word) 2. Modification of one or more sounds from within a word without changing the word's meaning (www.Dex.ro) Suppressing the final vowel of a word or the vowel which the next word starts with, when the first one ends with the same vowel which the following one starts with (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 150)
Ellipse	Style figure consisting of omitting from speech or from writing some implied elements or which aren't absolutely necessary to communication (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 150)
Enjambement	Poetical procedure (on the purpose of highlighting some words) consisting of passing a part of the phrase or of the sentence or of some words in the next verse (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 223)
Entimema	Short form of syllogism, which one of the premises of the conclusion isn't expressed in, but it is presupposed (www.Dex.ro)
Enumeration	Successively counting, one by one, naming, one by one, the elements of a whole; listing. The action of enumerating and its result; listing, counting (www.Dex.ro)
Epanaiplosis	Style figure consisting of repeating the same word or group of words at the beginning and at the end of a syntactic unit (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 153)
Epanalepsis	Rhetorical figure consisting of repeating one of more words or of repeating the initial word at the end of the verse or of the phrase (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 153)
Epanorthosis	Style figure consisting of retracting or repeating what has been said in the same enunciation, on the purpose of correcting the enunciation or a notion; correction (www.Dex.ro)
Epinomis	Style figure excessively employing the conjunction (and/or) in a sentence (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 156)
Epiphonema	Sententious declaration which a discourse or a story finished with (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 154)
Epiphora	Style figure consisting of repeating the words at the end of the sentences, of the phrases, or of the strophes (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 155)
Epiphrasis	Rhetorical figure which a seemingly finished phrase is added through, one or several parts, which an accessory idea is developed in (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 155)
Epithet	Style figure consisting of determining a substantive or a verb by an adjective or an adverb, in order to highlight a trait of the object, of the person, or of the action, on the purpose of giving more expressiveness (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 159)
Equivocal	1. Ambiguous: expression, attitude, situation 2. Expression modality used within some literary currents: baroque, modernism etc. (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 147)

Erotic	1. Expressing love sentiments 2. The totality of the literary compositions singing the love sentiment (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 163)
Esoteric	The cyphered writing reserved to the initiated one (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 166)
Etopee	The psychic or moral portrait presenting especially the soul's traits, qualities, defects, or the habits of a literary character (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 168)
Euhemerism	(Mircea Eliade used it) That way of interpreting the mythology considering that the myths come out of real historical events or characters. Euhemerism presupposes that the historical accounts become exaggerated myths by retelling them, by accumulation of specifications and modifications, which reflect the morals. The term comes from the mythographer Euhemerus, who lived in the Fourth Century BC (www.wikipedia.com)
Euphemism	Stylistic procedure consisting of replacing an unpleasant, offending, indecent word or expression, but still preserving a parallelism of meaning (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 168)
Excurse	1. Deviation from subject in order to clarify a secondary aspect 2. Dissertation under a digression form, done on the occasion of commenting a passage from an antique author (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 171)
Expolitio	Style figure consisting of repeating, in sentence or in phrase, an idea, this time by using other words, aiming to a as clear and beautiful as possible expression (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 171)
Fable	Species of the epic genre, short allegorical narration in prose or in verses, which the characters are animals, plants, or things in (placed in human circumstances), humorizing certain forms of behavior or character traits, having a moral finality explicitly or implicitly expressed (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 179)
Fabulous	Belonging to the fable domain, with the meaning of imagination's story, unreal. The fabulous is a category of the fantastic, applied especially to the legend, to the popular ethos, and to the writings derived out of these ones (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 171)
Factors of measuring the units in prose	In prose, the dimensions of the units is controlled especially by two factors: the so-called "breathing groups" for sentences, and the length of the short term memory for phrases (Nida 2004: 77)
Fiction	1. Representation produced by somebody's imagination, without correspondent in reality 2. Artistical creation's specific side, suggesting the impression of some real events, while actually presenting imagination's contrivances, invented by author (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 186)
Figurative	Words, expressions, or their meanings, used in another mode than usually (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 187)
Florilegia	Anthological collection of literary texts (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 189)
Fragmentism	Characteristic and technique of the modern poetry in the XX Century. The term appears in Romanticism, relating to the

	language's magic which can cut off the world in fragments. A. Rimbaud proclaimed, for the first time, as practical experiment: the disorder, the confusion, the rupture between parties, sensorial fragmentary images, disparate and arbitrarily put together. In the modern literature this phenomena is cultivated frequently in the form of the linguistic technique, through the influence of the phenomenon of dislocating the traditional syntax, by using the verb without determinants, by excessive nominalization, by the aspect of a poetry as note (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 189)
Galiamtias (nonsense)	A term designating a confuse, unintelligible text (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 195)
Grotesque	Aesthetical category expressing the reality in fantastic, bizarre, disproportionate, and caricatural shapes (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 205)
Hermeticism	Tendency of cyphering the lyrical communication in an esoteric manner. The occult symbolism, the sibylline expression, the verb's transcendence by being endowed with magical powers – defining the hermetic text (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 163)
Hieratical	1. Belonging to holy things 2. (in art) Represents or upholds the presentation of the characters in conventional, solemn, rigid attitudes, according to the rules established in religious canons (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 209)
Hyperbaton	1. Inversion of the normal topics 2. style figure indicating the chaos which the writer can make in the final part of an enunciation, where the enunciation could be finished (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 209)
Hyperbole	Style figure consisting of exaggerating by increasing of by decreasing the size of the objects, of the phenomenon, of the sentiments etc. on the purpose of potentiating the expressiveness of the literary work (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 210)
Hypotyposis	Style figure consisting of vividly depicting, by gradually accumulating epithets, a person, an event, or an object (www.Dex.ro)
Imprecation	Stylistic procedure consisting of expressing the desire for a person to be punished (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 220)
Insertion	Introducing an adding within a text (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 223)
Interrogation	Style figure consisting or one of more questions which the author doesn't expect to be answered; it is employed especially in poetry and in rhetoric (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 224)
Invective	Stylistic procedure consisting of using violent, aggressive expression (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 226)
Inversion	Rhetoric procedure consisting of changing the usual order of the words in phrase, in order to obtain stylistic effects (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 226)
Irony	Word, phrase, expression, affirmation, containing a slight mockery addressed to somebody or to something, usually employing significations opposed to the usual meaning. The self-irony is the irony addressed to the own person (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 227)

Joke	Short laughable story with unexpected final (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 195)
Litotes	1. Style figure consisting of highlighting an idea or a sentiment through negation or attenuation. As linguistic structure the litotes isn't laconic, for its effects depends on the expression's plentifulness. The litotes replaces the violent enunciation for the clever, indirect expression, meant to give its object the most suggestive, the most vivid image, its domain always being a moral one 2. Saying as little as possible in order to let understanding as much as possible 3. Style figure consisting of attenuating the features, in decreasing the dimension of a being or of an object etc. in order to obtain the opposite effect (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 253)
Loan	Word, lexical construction etc. taken from another language. Linguistic loan. Element of language, of culture, of art, integrated in another system (www.Dex.ro)
Locution	Words group having a unitary meaning, and behaving from grammatical point of view as a sole part of speech (www.Dex.ro)
Maxim	1. Enunciation concisely formulated expressing an ethical principle, a behavior norm etc. 2. The common sense attributes the maxim a large extension, so that it includes also the adages, the aphorisms, the apothegms, the precepts, and the verdicts (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 258)
Metaphor	Style figure resulting out of a comparison implied by substituting the word, the comparison object, for the image object (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 263) The metaphor is a deviation of the meaning through the similarity of the significations of the two associated elements, which have at least a common lexeme; it replaces a signifier for another (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 378-379). Some metaphors are lexicalized and recognized from cultural point of view as cliches. Even having a similar context in two languages, this doesn't mean an identify amongst the metaphors from those language (Lungu-Badea 2003: 70)
Metaphrase	1. Transposing a poetry in prose 2. Anaphora using synonyms in order to avoid the repetitions (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 267)
Metasemia	Term designating the changes of meaning: deviations of meanings, differing meanings, metaphors, metonymies, metaphorical or metonymical deviations of meaning (Lungu-Badea 2003: 71)
Metonymy	Style figure based on the logical contiguity between objects, consisting of naming the object being in a logical relation, as there is the report between cause and effect, or vice versa (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 267) Rhetoric procedure which a concept is expressed through, with the help of another concept, which it is in a cause/effect relation with;

	the metonymy is another form of meanings deviation by associating the meanings and not by likening them as in the case of the metaphor (Lungu-Badea 2003: 72)
Oxymoron	Style figure expressing a subtle irony or a blistering truth in the form of a paradoxical association of two contradictory terms (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 290)
Paradox	1. Contradictory enunciation but in the same time demonstrable; absurd opinion, contrary to the unanimously recognized truth; oddity; enormity; absurdity (www.Dex.ro)

Affirmation contradicting the recognized points of view. Often, the paradoxical thinking and formulation are used in order to advance a new, bold idea, on the purpose of making that idea more obvious (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 294) |
Parallel	Species of description which two beings, things, or events, are put next to one another through (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 296)
Parenthesis	Written digression (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 297)
Paronomasia	Style figure consisting of repeating the basic word, developed on the purpose of creating an image, but especially for the sound effect of the expression (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 298)
Pastel	Species of the lyrical genre, which is depicted a corner of nature through, of a landscape. The predominant element in pastel it is the description of the nature, the poet's sentiment being expressed through its mediation (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 299)
Periphrasis	Expressing a simple idea by using several words (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 304)
Personification	Style figure which animals of the nature's phenomena are attributed human features (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 306)
Phonetic transcription (from a foreign language)	Stylistic procedure of rendering a word from a foreign language as it sounds; sometimes the rendering takes place in a deformed manner (www.Dex.ro)
Pleonasm	Style figure consisting of putting next to one another two words having the same meaning (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 310)
Poetical license	The writers' deviation from diverse rules (literary, grammatical, topical etc.) in order to increase the stylistic expressiveness, or due to some prosodic requirements (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 246)
Polysyndeton	Construction achieved by repeatedly using the "and" conjunction, in order to strengthen the idea of multitude and intensity, highlighting each member of an enumeration of each sentence in a phrase (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 314)
Portrait	1. Presenting the physical and moral aspects of a character in a literary word
2. Literary work which a character is describe in (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 315)
Prolepsis	Stylistic procedure, used especially in the judiciary elocution, which consists of expressing an idea sooner than expected, either in order

	of highlighting it more, or for rejecting, anticipatedly, a possible objection (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 319)
Prosopopoeia	Rhetoric figure which the author puts to speak an absent person through, a deceased person, or an allegorical character. Or the author attributed actions, sentiments etc. to be absent persons (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 325)
Prothesis	Adding one or more sounds at the beginning of a word without that word to change its meaning (www.Dex.ro)
Pun	Word play based on equivocal or on the resemblance in forms of some words which differ as meaning (www.Dex.ro)
Repetition	Syntactical-stylistic procedure consisting of using twice or more, the same word or group of words, the same syntagm or grammatical relation, in order to express the duration, the intensity, the distribution, the progression, the succession, the periodicity, or in order to highlight an idea (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 334)
Reticence	Intentional omission, keeping the silence regarding a certain thing, that must be said; reserve, in a certain matter. Rhetorical figure which the speaker passes to another idea through, by suddenly interrupting his exposition, only hinting at what he intended to say; intentional omission of a thought; an omitted thing (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 334)
Solecism	Style figure consisting in the lack of accord between subject and predicate (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 363)
Sophism	Syllogism or reasoning, that is formally correct, but it is wrong in its content (being bases on an equivocal, on using the unessential aspects of the phenomena etc.); it is often used in order to deceive (www.Dex.ro)
Style	(from rhetorical point of view) Casual, vigorous, elaborated (Nida 2004: 17) The rhetorical structures constitute the main ingredients of the style. Although, sadly, the term "style" has been used to designate aspects of the texts which differ from one another. Sometimes through "style" one understands the writing particularities of an author. Some other times, the term expresses the conformity of a text to a certain norm of the genre which that text belongs to. In other situations,. The word "style" can be associated to the idea of realism. We read sometimes about somebody that "he doesn't have style", and that could mean that he writes poorly, or that there is no distinctive note of his writing mode (Nida 2004: 78-79)
Style – casual	(from rhetorical and semiotic point of view) In the casual style, the content is more important than the shape; it uses a small number of rhetoric procedures. A casual style still mustn't be regarded as a flat or neutral style. It is probably harder to use the casual style than to use the vigorous or the elaborated styles. The casual style has a very important semiotic meaning: it suggests sincerity and objectivity. The fact that the source considers the subject of such importance than it doesn't need any rhetorical surplus, it certainly constitutes a positive aspect of the casual style

	(Nida 2004: 79)
Style- emphatic (vigorous)	(from rhetorical and semiotic point of view) The vigorous style is an emphatic style, which it is granted a special attention in, to the accentuation and to the highlighting. Its pressing and succinct character, it is obviously abundant in rhetorical figures, as: the repetition, the parallelism, and the order change (Nida 2004: 79)
Suppressing the punctuation signs	Writing without using punctuation signs (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 364)
Syllepsis	Syntactical construction which the words are accorded in depending on their association, and not conform to the rules of the usual grammar (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 355)
Syncope	Phonetical phenomenon characterized by the disappearance of a vowel or of an non-accentuated syllable from within a word (being replaced by an apostrophe) (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 359)
	Synecdoche Style figure consisting of enlarging or narrowing the meaning of a word by using the whole instead of the part (and vice versa), of the individual instead of general (and vice versa), of the matter which a thing is made of, instead of that thing itself (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 360) Special case of metonymy, the synecdoche (Gr. συνεκδοχή = meaning in the same time) it is a rhetorical figure which a word is conferred an individual signification through (which, in its own meaning can have a larger or a narrower signification). While in the case of the metonymy a word is replaced for another, in the case of synecdoche is used the whole for the part and vice versa. In translation the synecdoche is frequently used and it can constitute a modality of deviating the meaning through association (Ballard 2001: 99). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 88-89)
Syneresis	Phonetic procedure resulting out of the fusion - resulting an ascending diphthong - of two neighbor vowels, one from the end of the first word and another from the beginning of the next word, the first vowel becoming a semi-vowel (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 361)
Tautophony	Excessively repeating a sound, creating an unpleasant effect (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 377)
Tmesis	Intercalation of a sound, or of a syllable, or of several words, between the component elements of a composed word, or of a phraseological unit (www.Dex.ro)
Topography	Stylistic procedure used in the context of a literary work in order to present the place and often combined with the chronography (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 377)
Tropes – types	Repetitions, omissions, changes in the receivers expectations (Nida 2004: 74-75)
Verisimilar	Aesthetical category defining the closeness to the human life's reality, conferring to the human life's transfiguration in images the attribute of truth, of credibility (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 405)

| Zeugma | Style figure which two or more substantives are united through, with a verb or with an adjective which, logically, they do not refer except to one of the two substantives (Marin, Nedelciu 2004: 408) |

General Linguistics, Text's Linguistics, Language-uses' Philosophy, Language's Theory, History of the Language-use's Philosophy, Meaning's Hermeneutics

Translating Eugeniu Coșeriu's works in English language, it is a duty of honor to us, because we consider the world as being deprived of fueling its knowledge reservoir, out of this great linguist's works – one of the greatest ever. And this is because he wrote in the Italian, in the Spanish, and in the Romanian languages, so he is unknow to the planet's people whose communication language is English (regardless their native language). Coșeriu must be translated in English for his work is a world patrimony on: general linguistics, text's linguistic, language-use philosophy, language-use theory etc. We consider Eugeniu Coșeriu in linguistics as great as Mircea Eliade was in the history of the religions.

I think you have already noticed the term that we've just used: *language-use*… This represents a case of "translation impossibility", and the only way we have found to get out of this impasse was to employ - as our Magistra, univ. prof. PhD habil. Loredana Pungă recommended us - the syntagm: *language-use*.

While in the English *language* there is no dichotomy, clearly formulated as such, between *language* and *language-use*, we are going to try, briefly, to present some aspects one mandatorily needs in order to perceive Eugeniu Coșeriu's work, for in his linguistics, discerning between *language* and *language-use* is paramount.

In the Romance languages, the mentioned distinction it has been in use for a long time now. In the following table we will mention, comparatively, the terms used, in a few languages:

Nationality	Language	Language-use
Romanian	limbă	limbaj
French	langue	langage
Spanish	lengua	lenguaje

Consequently, we are going to understand by using the term *language*, the followings: a communication system composed of articulated sounds – sounds which can be written by using a signs system -, specific to humans, which the humans express their thoughts, their sentiments, and their desires through; the *language* is historically constituted, and characterized through own grammatical structure, phonetics, and lexicon; the *common language* is a stage in the evolution of a language, previous to the dialectal differentiation; koine. There are *historical languages* (no longer in use, dead languages) and *living languages* currently in use.

Language-use, as employed by Eugeniu Coșeriu, it represents the *language* as *used* on a given time, in a certain domain, by a certain group of individuals or by one individual, and it includes also other means and procedures than the articulated sounds - the *language-use*, from this perspective, it comprises also the *paralinguistic* elements and the *extralinguistic* elements, used in communication.

We aim to achieve in our dichotomy (*language / language-use*) a structure similar to that created by Ferdinand de Saussure by using the terms: *langue* and *parole*: *langue* (*langage)* means the abstract, the systematic rules and conventions, of a *signifying* system, independent and pre-existent to the individual user and that involves the principles which no meaningful utterance would be possible without; *parole* (French: speech, word) (*language-use*) refers to the concrete instance of the *use of language*.

A	
A *language*'s grammar	The conventional symbolizing of a semantic structure of a *language* (Nida 2004: 12)
Accent: tonic / of intensity / expiratory	To intensity it corresponds, from linguistical point of view, what is called as tonic accent, intensity accent, or expiratory accent (accent based on intensifying the exhaling when pronouncing the accentuated syllable, E. l. t.'s n.) (Coșeriu 1999: 15) The accent doesn't distinguish words, but phonetic groups: the accent enumerates the "phonic words" (Coșeriu 1999: 16)
Acoustic intensity	The recorder wave presents, in addition to these, a certain amplitude and a certain frequency: these two qualities are the ones which, together, they determined the acoustic intensity (Coșeriu 1999: 104)

Actualization (of the *language*)	Using the *language* (Coșeriu 2009: 334)
Adequate or inadequate affirmation	On the text's level, which the expressive knowledge corresponds to, I speak about "adequation"; something can be adequate or inadequate, regardless being correct or incorrect. Of course, here too it is applied the principle of the progressive determination: the adequation can suspend the correctness and, what it is linguistically incorrect it can be adequate to certain texts (Coșeriu 2013: 73)
Ad-stratum	Namely a neighbor language (Coșeriu 1999: 82)
Aesthetical sign	By disassembling the sign in four "strata" and by indicating the diverse types of "connotations", Johansen wanted to propose a model of the aesthetical sign. It is about a "second degree" sign: the linguistic signs function, at their turn, as bearer of signs for this entire complex of the "connotation" and, according to Johansen, this complex must be considered as the content itself of the art (Coșeriu 2013: 154-155)
Affricate	The sound "c" and "g" can be considered as "affricate" (Coșeriu 1999: 116) A last type of sounds which must be taken in consideration from the articulation's point of view, it is that of the affricate, namely consonants whose articulation starts with an occlusion and it ends with a friction; from articulatory point of view, it is about double sounds and which, consequently, are transcribed as such. Thus, we have the dental sound affricate dz (z Italian dinzanzara), the dental deaf affricate (z Italian nazione or the German zehn), the palatal sound affricate dz (dj from French Djibouti), the palatal deaf affricate ts (tch form French tcheque or German Deutsch-land). Many researchers include amongst affricate also the medium-palatal occlusives c and g (Coșeriu 1999: 119)
Agent function	The "agent" function, characteristic to the speaking by and large, it corresponds quite often, to the function of subject, specific to a *language*, but not necessarily and, even empirically, not in all the cases. It stays in the things' nature that many of these linguistic general/common categories not to find, by and large, their expression in the individual *languages*, and to simply obey the communicational context and situation (Coșeriu 2013: 77)
American school (of structuralism)	The American structuralism develops simultaneously to the European structuralism, and as explicit doctrine it is even anterior to that one, for we can say that the structuralism "officially" appeared in the year 1925, since the founding of the American Society of Linguistics and of its Review entitled Language, which in a few years ended to be the best review on general linguistics. This structuralism have been developed also due to practical reasons, imposed by the description of the indigenous languages from America. For these languages the categories of the traditional

grammar, inherited from Greek and Latin, characteristic to the Indo-European languages, they proved to be inadequate. On the other hand, these languages couldn't be studied in texts, in in a "philological" manner, for they lacked the written tradition. Int his sense, the immediate precursor of the American structuralism was the ethnologist and the linguist of German origin, F. Boas, the initiator and the director of the great collective work Handbook of American Indian Languages (1911-1938). Rightly so, in the preface to the first volume of this work, Boas formulated very clearly – on the line of the Humboldtian tradition – the fundamental principle according to which each language must be described in conformity with its own categories. Ed. Sapir, the disciple of Boas (him too, of German origin, but established in America in his childhood), he applied coherently this principle both in his studied on the indigenous origins and in several writing on linguistic and grammatical theory, as also in his work of introduction in linguistics -Language – published in 1921. With this, Sapir – one of the most profound and perspicacious linguists of our century (XX Century, E. l. t.'s n.), in the same time a man with a vast intellectual and artistic culture, and himself an artist – he founded a first "American" structuralism, though a rather implicit structuralism. Already in Language he formulated, without using this term, the concept of "phoneme" as phonic unit intuit by the speakers of a language (namely, more or less in the sense given to this term by B. de Courtenay); and a little later he introduced, concerning the sounds too, the concept of pattern, concept which became specific to the America structuralism, corresponding to the concept of "paradigm" (or "system") from the European structuralism. Regarding the grammatical structure, of a fundamental importance is the linguistic typology formulate by Sapir (contained in Language). From the same author we have, inside the American structuralism, the "anthropological" variant of the structuralism, according to which it isn't accepted the methodological exclusion of the signified, and the languages are considered relatedly to the entire culture of the communities of their speakers (Coșeriu 2000: 122-123)

Analogic change	(the speaker, E. l. t.'s n.) can create a sign according to a model differing from that one normally used by the community (Coșeriu 1999: 57)
Analogists / the analogical position	The "analogical position" was partially adopted by the representatives of the School of Alexandria, who contributed, to a large extent, to constituting the morphological paradigms, a fact that, of course, it determined them to supra-appreciate the regulated character (ἔγκλισις) of the *language* (Coșeriu 2011: 155)
Analogy theory (cause of linguistic change)	The theory of the analogy explains the linguistic changes or, at least, most of them, through a tendency towards "regularity" observed in all languages, namely through the tendency of assimilating the aberrant forms ("irregular") to "regular" forms, to more common forms (…) Considering the phenomenon form

	point of view of the linguistic act, we should say that the individual who creates that expression he is wrong in selecting his model, and he produces a new form of a model which isn't that one generally used in his linguistic community and, by letting himself influenced by more common grammatical forms or, often, by forms which, in a way, they belong to the same category or they constitute a pair with that one of his linguistic act, as synonyms, antonyms etc. (…) The analogy, as we can see, it is a general phenomenon in languages and it explains, in many cases, if not the motif, at least the mechanism of the linguistic change. But we cannot consider it, by any means, as a necessary law of the expression: the analogical change doesn't have to take place, but it can take place (or not), given the fact that the speaker is the master and the creator of his expression; and the linguists cannot foresee this change, but they only can record it, when it has taken place (Coșeriu 1999: 86-87
Analogy's absence in forming the words	Namely the irregular configuration of the lexical families: If the substantive-verb relation corresponds to a real situation, then, to each substantive there will have to be a corresponding verb, which isn't true (Coșeriu 2011: 69)
Analytic grammar	The analytic grammar starts, according to Gabelentz, with the sentence and it reaches the minimal element of the *language* (namely it "unveils" these elements) (Coșeriu 2000: 160)
Announcement	Kainz introduces the term of Bericht / "announcement" [abut also: Versändigung "notification / understanding", Information; cf. Psychologie der Sprache, quoted work, p. 176]. Understood so, the announcement (Bericht) is a function being on the same plan with the notification (the expression) and the provocation (the appeal) (Coșeriu 2013: 104)
Anomalists / the anomalist position	The "anomalist" position has been adopted by the representatives of the School of Perge; for instance, Crates from Mallos (Second Century BC), a follower both of the Stoic School and of the School from Perge, he stubbornly highlighted the irregularities from flexion (as for instance Βίας, Βίαντος or Λυσίας, Λυσίου). In De Analogia, Julius Caesar embraced the Alexandrines position, while the Roma grammarian Marcus Terentius Varro, in his work De lingua Latina – preserved only partially – he argues both positions based on examples (Coșeriu 2011: 155)
Anthropological linguistics	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000: 127)
Anthroponymy	The historical study of the proper names (persons' names) (Coșeriu 1999: 100)
Anti-atomism principle	In a first form, the anti-atomism's principle implies, as a first corollary, the distinction between the empirical study (description and history) and theory: the theory refers to "what is universal", whilst the empirical study establishes "what is general" in the researched facts. Consequently, it is made the distinction – in diverse domains – in more or less explicit mode, between the

	"general" theory and the science of the same facts; thus, between the literary theory and the science of the literature, between the theory of the art and the science of the art, between the theory of the *language-use* and the "general linguistics". In the same time, the report between the empirical study and theory is inversed. One notices that the theory, by not being possible to be built up through abstraction and generalization, it cannot be placed "after" the empirical study, as final result of this one (which can only ascertain the "general"), but, a contrary, it is ideally previous to such a study. Better said, it is obvious that the theory is present previously, during, and after the empirical study, also as implicit or explicit motivation of identifying and delimitating the studied facts, during the study, frame which the facts are described, interpreted and ordered within. After that, as enriched / modified theory, grace to the same empirical study, for instance, by ascertaining some facts and aspects which aren't concordant to their initial postulates. Thus, it is affirmed that, in the research practice, between theory and the empirical study there is a constant dialectical report: the theory presents the previous foundation of each empirical study, and the study's results influence, at their turn, the theory, by ascertaining it and/or by modifying it. In the nature's sciences, the previous theory take the form of some hypotheses regarding the universality of the facts – hypotheses which constitute the foundation and the frame of the empirical study -, being possible to be modified or substituted for others, consequently to such a study. Instead, in the sciences of the culture, where, by being about human creations, about what the man himself produces freely and intentionally, there aren't possible hypotheses regarding the universality, the previous foundation being the original knowledge the man has about himself and about his free activities and which, of course, are explained, are ascertained, and of modified consequently to the empirical study. And in theory, in its explicit form, it is, in this case, about transposing on the plan of the reflexivity, namely on the plan of the science rationally motivated and founded, intuitively, for instance about art, about *language-use*, and about science, these one being themselves creator subjects (Coșeriu 2000: 41-42)
	The acceptation of the principle of the anti-atomism, especially in its second, "rational" form, it is practically general, though the considered relations can differ according to the cases and to the aspects of the *language-use*, which, on each time, it is referred to. Regarding its first form, the "universalistic" one, there is an ample accord – at least a mutual accord – in what is essential, even if not also regarding the details of its application and not referring to its multiple implications. Despite all these, nobody is, today, totally "atomist" (Coșeriu 2000: 78)
Anti-mentalist and	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000: 128)

asemantic method	
Antipositivism	Around the year 1900, under the more or less direct influence of the new philosophical currents and as reflex of those ones, it starts affirming in sciences, especially in the humanistic ones and in culture by and large, a new "ideology": the fundamentally antipositivist ideology. Although still attached, in some aspects, to positivism (even if its new forms were more refined or, a contrary, more rigid), this ideology attempted to overcome some of the more obvious insufficiencies of the previous positivism (Coșeriu 2000: 36)
Appellatives as classes names	To the *language*'s lexicon belong numerous general notions (Appelativa) falling under the competence of the general science (…) It is, in this case, not about proper names, but it is about designations of some classes, and the general science occupies itself with the origin of the classes designated by this appellatives (Coșeriu 2011: 36)
Arbitrariness of the linguistic sign	(arbitraire du signe, in Saussure's terms) namely of ascertaining the fact that the linguistic signs do not have a "natural" motivation; in other words, there is no causal relation between words and the "things" which the words signify or designate (Coșeriu 2000: 12) The idea of the "signs' arbitrariness" is, therefore, constant in the *language-use*'s theory, as notion, since Aristotle and, as term, at least since G. C. Scaligero. (Coșeriu 2000: 13)
Archiphonemes	Phonic units existing only in cases of neutralization and which do not coincide to any of the units whose opposition they have suspended (Coșeriu 2000: 210)
Architecture facts of a *language*	The architecture facts, instead, they correspond to the formulas: Namely, analogue forms (or practically identical) for different values, or, on the opposite, different forms for analogue values (or practically identical); in other words, with the same formulas valid in the case too, of the different historical *languages*. Only quantitatively, and not also qualitatively, the variety within the architecture of a historical *language* it is distinct from the variety ascertained amongst autonomous historical *languages*; and, often it is not even from quantitative point of view (…) Just because of that the linguistic structures and functions must be established for each one of the functional *languages* delimited in the frame of a historical *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 279-280)
Architecture of the *language* ("the external structure")	The internal diversity of the *language* - namely the fact that, for analog functions, within the same historical *language* there coinhabit distinct forms (and vice versa), it constitutes the *language*'s architecture. Or, better said, the fact that a historical *language* is constituted of an ensemble of functional *languages*, which partially coincide to one another, and partially differ from one another, it represents the *language*'s architecture or its "external structure" (Coșeriu 2000: 277)

Architecture-*language* structure distinction	Let's remark that the norm, the system, and the linguistic type, they do not refer to the internal variety of the historical *language*, but they exclusively refer to the structuring of the same idiomatic technique, and therefore of any *language*. In this concern, it is necessary to distinguish together with Flydal, between the architecture and the structure of the *language*: the internal diversity of the *language* it indicates the fact that in the same historical *language*, for analogue functions coexist distinct forms (and vice versa), it constitutes the "architecture" of the *language*. Instead, the fact that the linguistic technique is structured (namely it presents functional oppositions in expression and content) it constitutes the "structure" of the *language*. Or, better said, the fact that a historical *language* is constituted of an ensemble of functional *languages*, which partially coincide and partially differ from one another, it represents the architecture or the "external structure", while the fact that amongst the units of the same functional *language*, namely of a unitary and homogenous *language*, there subsists certain relations, it represents their "internal structure" or simply the structure of this *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 277)

Often, in the descriptions of certain languages and, especially, in the criticism addressed to the structural descriptions, the two aspects are confounded, by affirming that certain oppositions are polysemantic, barely clear, or confusing, in a certain *language*, because the corresponding forms and/or functions aren't in the same reciprocal relation in all the regional types (and in others) of this *language*. But in reality, in such cases it isn't about the lack of clarity of the sentences, but it is about different oppositions which must be described separately. If some speakers use two forms, while other uses a sole form, by ignoring the opposition between them, this is a fact of *language* architecture, and not of structure. Instead, the fact that the same fact of speaking *feci* and *ho fatto* have different signified, because of being used in different situations of contexts (…) it is a structure fact (Coșeriu 2000: 278-279) |
Articulated *language-use*	The articulated *language-use* is considered as a unique system of signs only in ideal mode, because of existing in reality enormously numerous systems of signs (*languages*), corresponding to diverse countries and social communities, or to other groups of speakers (Coșeriu 1999: 35)
Artificial *languages*	The artificial *languages* are linguistic systems built up by one or several individuals, on the already existing historical *languages*, on the purpose of a universal diffusion, namely, as possible instruments of international understanding, above the national *languages*. Such are, for instance: Esperanto, Ido, Volapuk, Interlingua, basic English etc. (Coșeriu 1999: 46)
Associative configurations	In the domain of the lexicon, R. Guiraud, by trying to build up the "morpho-semantic field" of the word "cat" – even by limiting

	himself to "linguistic" associations motivated by the material form or by signified (but by understanding as signified the designation too) - he establishes an associative network of more than 2000 words. Of course, he could have extended this network, by starting from each point of this network and by establishing other associative networks, without being, in order to do that, forced to refer to the effective structure of the French lexicon. The associative configurations present, rightly, interest in psycholinguistics, as also in the linguistics of the speaking, and in the text's linguistics (cf. cap. X, 4. and 5.), but they don't constitute the object of the structural description of the *languages* (Coșeriu 2000: 139)
Autonomy of the level of the individual *languages*	The autonomy of the historical level, of the level of the individual languages, it mustn't be specially legitimated. By and large, it isn't contested the fact that the individual *languages* have different structures, different grammars, differently structure vocabularies - better said: lexical contents configured differently. The opinions become controversial only when asking if the level of the individual *languages* it doesn't coincide, partially, to the text's level. By this, we would reach to legitimate the autonomy of the text's level (Coșeriu 2013: 65)
Autonomy of the text / justification for the text's linguistics	The motivation itself of the text's autonomy and, by this, the motivation of the text's linguistics too, it is, of course, a functional one. Even by the fact that there is a type of content that is precisely a content of the texts, a content for texts, it justifies the acceptance of the autonomy on the text's level. That's why the text's linguistics too, respectively what we have called here as the first linguistics or the linguistics "itself" of the text, it is a "linguistics of the meanings" (Coșeriu 2013: 82)
Avulsive sounds	In almost all the *languages* the sounds are produced through the exhaling current (at least, the common sounds: the sound belonging to the corresponding phonological systems); but there are also inversive or avulsive sounds (and, more specifically, by using an English term we call them clicks, or in French: cliquements), are produced by the inhaling current. These sounds are very rare in the Indo-European *languages* (are encountered only in exclamations as, for instance, those used for driving the horses); these sound are, instead, usual and belonging to the respective phonological systems, in certain *languages* from Africa, namely in the Hottentot and Bushman *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 113)

B

Behaviorism	Theory placing at the basis of the psychology the undifferentiated behavior of the man and of the animal when they are submitted to

a stimulus external to their organisms (www.Dex.ro)

behaviorism (Coșeriu 2000: 57)

The real motif for the exclusion of the signified is this: the "behaviorist" or "anti-mentalist" conception on science, which Bloomfield adhered to, between the years 192201923, under the influence of A.P. Weiss. According to "behaviorism" (in psychology called as "behavior's psychology" or "behaviorism") – a methodological conception firstly developed within psychology, but which have been very quickly adopted and it reached to be dominant in the USA, in the human sciences by and large, so that, frequently, these sciences are there called as "behavioral sciences" -, only the physically observable fact can constitute the object of a science. In the man's case, these fact would be the acts of external behavior intersubjectively ascertainable, which a well-built machine could record, but even these acts would be take in consideration only starting with the moment one decides to be them systematically observed on the basis of a technique rigorously "objective". The scientist (or the researcher) can't, consequently, to refer to the interiority of the conscience (to the "mind"), which isn't intersubjectively noticeable, neither to what he knows about himself he can't employ the introspection and not even to refer to facts he has unsystematically observed, before starting a certain research. To linguistics, the immediate consequence of this fact it is that the signified must be excluded, under the pretext that it cannot be observed and studied in an "objective" mode. Rightly, the signified corresponds, according to the behaviorism, exactly to everything that cannot be an object of the scientific research: it isn't an act of external behavior, it doesn't belong to what can be intersubjectively observed, but it belongs to the conscience's interiority and it is known only through introspection. Or, the dominant fact to Bloomfield it is represented just by this conception on science; with some concessions done to the reality of the reality of the *language-use* and to the speakers' competence, Bloomfield takes in the linguistic activity, in consideration, only those aspects which his conception on science and on the scientific activity allows him to consider them, namely material and noticeable aspects, but not their motivation or their reason to exist, which is, exactly, the signified. More than that, even regarding what is physically noticeable, he doesn't interpret the linguistic knowledge according to the real meaning of the word, but only as regularity ascertained in the act of external behavior. In reality, Bloomfield know very well that the signified is a linguistic fact, even representing the definitory aspect of the *language-use*. In *Language* he defines the fundamental notion of "linguistic form" as "phonetic form having a signified", representing the grammar and the lexicology as sections of the

"semantics"; in addition to that, he often recognized that it is indispensable that us to refer also to the explicitly determined signified, especially to the to the categorial and grammatical signified (class-meanings). On the other hand, though, he insists upon the fact that the signified cannot be established and researched with the means of the linguistics, by considering the references to some signified as being inconsequence dictated by practical reasons: for several times he apologizes for the fact that he must do them or, a contrary, he shows himself satisfied when succeeding to avoid them. Some of his most faithful disciples and descendants, they wanted to go even further and they attempted to develop a linguistics rigorously "asemantic", by applying in all the domains of the description and in the definitions they gave to the categories, some strictly "distributional" techniques (based on the position and on the combination of the material forms). This is, especially, the attitude of Z. S. Harris (Coşeriu 2000: 92-94)

The behaviorism represent, without any doubt, an extraordinary effort in order to reach a total objectivity in the scientifical study, but the objectivity it aspires to, it doesn't refer to the cultural objects in their essence and, consequently, it isn't effective objectivity, but, a contrary, a lack of scientific objectivity. And the behaviorist method, far from being scientific, as often pretends, it is, rigorously speaking, exactly the contrary of scientific, because of contravening to the fundamental exigences of the scientific research, namely that of "saying the things as they are" (cf. chapter IV), in what concerns the linguistics, the *language-use* couldn't be studied and not even delimited, if we make abstraction of these, because ones, without them, it ceases to be *language-use*: the *language-use* has fundamentally a significative finality and it cannot be considered, consequently, as being independent from this finality. That's why, even "the keenest behaviorists", when approaching linguistic problems, they constantly refer to signified, at least implicitly; and no matter how much effort they spend, they cannot get rid of this references. So it is explained the fact that the behaviorism itself, it attempt to reduce the signified to something else – to the totality of the situations or of the contexts which a form appears and expresses itself in – just for being possible to be studies as "observable fact". But we must remark that ascertaining all the situations or all the contexts it is impossible from empirical and rational point of view, and this constitutes a permanent and insurmountable obstacle for a strictly behaviorist semantics. Even if such a thing had been possible, what had been studied wouldn't have been the signified (a mental fact), but something radically different. In this case, neither it is true that the signified would have been understood from (or it would have resulted out of) situation and context. Through situation and context, the signified only is delimited and it is specified in report with the designation, and in case of ambiguity (homophony of the forms, for instance) it

	can be identified a certain signified and not another. In what concerns the understanding, the signified is always and exclusively understood by knowing the *language* that it belongs to. It is totally different to say that the signified are learnt in situations and contexts, an affirmation that really is correct. But learning the signified, though, (as the learning of a *language*, by and large) it is a creator activity going beyond what is ascertained in situations and contexts: what is ascertained, it is, on each case, a certain designation, while what "is learnt" it is a signified, an infinite possibility of designation (not "this tree", for instance, but "tree" in general) (Coșeriu 2000: 97)
Biological functions of the *languages*	The biological function of the *languages* imply the naming, the enunciation, the shaping, the answer, and the thinking (Nida 2004: 159)
Bloomfieldian linguistics	On the other hand, the Bloomfieldians (and Bloomfield himself) got close to the "anthropological" linguistics, to that in most cases, the common ideology is today more perceivable than the differences, and sometimes, there are less differences between a Sapirian and a Bloomfieldian than between two Bloomfieldians as such. Belong to the Bloomfieldian group as such, in the first place the direct collaborators of Bloomfield: B. Bloch and G.L. Trager; R.S. Wells (who developed a Bloomfieldian stylistics), Ch. C. Fries (the author of an important English grammar and of a beautiful book on the teaching of the national *language*), M. Joos (who, amongst other things, he tried to elaborate a distributional semantics), Ch. E. Hockett (a flexible and clever theoretician in diverse domains, from phonology to linguistic universals), and Z. S. Harris (Coșeriu 2000: 127)
Bloomfieldian type grammars	The structural grammars of "Bloomfieldian" type are focused on the material "constitution", namely upon the "morphological" description, and they verry briefly treat the functions. Regarding the relations, these ones aren't treated, usually, at all (or, at least, they aren't differentiated from the functions themselves) (Coșeriu 2000: 229)
Bloomfieldian-ism	One can say that in bloomfieldian-ism it isn't about a conception on language, but it is about a conception about science and about the scientific method. And the signified isn't eliminated from the *language-use*; the signified is excluded from the science of *language-use*. The signified is recognizes as being essential in the *language-use* itself, but they consider that: a) it cannot be studied because of not being possible to observe it; b) it cannot be used for studying other aspects of the language because of not representing a knowledge achieved through a scientific method (Coșeriu 2000: 95)

In the case of the Bloomfieldian-ism, instead, the *languages* are reduced to natural objects out of a methodological necessity, namely in the virtue of a conception about science (Coșeriu 2000: 97) |

	In the strict Bloomfieldian-ism they cannot refer to signified, because this would imply resorting to introspection. Here is perfectly legit, instead, to speak about the phonic substance, for this belongs to something that can be observed from physical point of view. That's why, though they admit that the phenomena are distinctive, their identification won't be done through the mediation of the commutation, but through the mediation of the so-called "complementary distribution": two sounds appearing in the same phonic context (namely which are in "complementary distribution", so that where one of them occurs the other one doesn't, and vice versa), they normally belong to the same phoneme (Coșeriu 2000: 99-100)

C

Cataphora	General principle of the enunciative linguistics, opposed to anaphora. It consists of announcing through a discourse fragment, a cataphoric element (substitute), a part of the context which follows to be introduced (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 355) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Ceneme-atics (Ceneme-ics)	A science describing the cenemes just like units of "form", by establishing the relations which characterize them (Coșeriu 2000: 90)
Cenemes (in glossematics)	The basis units of the expression plan for glossematics are not the phonemes, but they are the cenemes: purely forma units which can be materialized in the "linguistic use" as phoneme, grapheme etc. (Coșeriu 2000: 89-90)
Characteristics of the levels of the idiomatic structuring	All the levels of the grammatical structuring of a *language* present, in principle, four characteristics: 1) supra-ordination or hyper-ordination, namely the possibility that the units belonging to an inferior level to be able to function "on the substitutive mode" on a higher level, for instance that a word to be able to function as an enunciation; 2) subordination or hypo-ordination, namely the possibility that the units which belong from constitutive point of view to a superior level, to be able to function from constitutive point of view "on the substitutive mode", on an inferior level, for instance that the syntagm to be able to function as word; 3) coordination, namely the possibility that the units belonging to one and the same level to be able to relate to one another, for instance a word with another word, or an enunciation with another enunciation, and 4) the substitution or the replacement, namely the possibility that a unit belonging to a level to possibly be replaced anticipatedly (cataphorically) or in repeated mode (anaphorically, respectively with epiphoras) through an appropriate "proforma", for instance a name through a pronoun or a verb through a verbum

	vicarium (Coșeriu 2013: 218)
Classes of predicable objects (according to Aristotle)	In Analitica Priora (Ἀναλυτικὰ πρότερα, 43a, 20 and the followings), Aristotle divided the object sin three classes: a) Object which generally cannot be affirmed about other objects, as for instance Kleon, Kallias, and other such things, and which can be individually understood; b) Object which can be affirmed about other objects, but about which one cannot affirm anything else (Aristotle didn't give any example in this sense, but he thought, of course, at what can be placed in the highest point of the abstraction pyramid, therefore τὸ ὄν, "what exists"); c) Object which by and large can be affirmed about other objects, and which, at their turn, can be attributed to other objects. Thus, ἄνθρωπος, for instance, it can be affirmed about Καλλίας – "Kallias is a man"; on the other hand, about ἄνθρωπος cannot be said anything else – as for instance ζῷον -: " The man is a living creature". Thus, it seems as obvious the fact that to Aristotle the expressions for subject and predicate they represent substitutes for objects (Coșeriu 2011: 120)
Classification: Aristotelian writings'	Andronicus of Rhodes, former leader of the peripatetic School, he edited the texts gathered from Aristotle, and that constituted the nucleus of the present *Corpus Aristotelicum*. From Andronicus and from later commentators, as there were Ammonius and Boethius (VI Century A.D.) it has been preserved to us the classification we are still using today, of the Aristotelian writings: 1. theoretical propaedeutics, logical-scientifical ("Organon") 2. ethics, politics, rhetoric, and poetics 3. nature's science and the psychology 4. "prime philosophy" (prima filosofia), by and large called as "metaphysics", because of being collationed (Gr. μετά)according to the writing on physics But we doubt that this division was "thought" by Aristotle himself (Coșeriu 2011: 101)
Classifications: of the sounds	The simplest, but not the most comfortable, neither the most used, it is the classification adopted by Ferdinand de Saussure in his *Course of General Linguistics* and which is based exclusively on the aperture of the phonator apparatus. Saussure distinguished six classes of sounds, from those ones with zero aperture (occlusives or explosives, namely pronounced with a total closure of the phonator tube, to the ones with the aperture 6, that one of the "A" vowel. Between these extremes, Saussure order the fricative consonants, the spirants, the nasals, the "semivowels" "I" and "U", and the vowels "E" and "O". This classification is perfectly rational, it is based on a unique criterion, and it has, in addition to this, the advantage of including in a unique series of classes, the vowels and the consonants (of the "constrictive"). Despite these, in linguistics, usually, they prefer the classification based on the criterion of the articulation place; this classification is used especially for consonants, while for vowels is used the Saussure's

94

one (Coșeriu 1999: 113)

Let's see the classification according to the articulation place. There are, in the first place, sounds pronounced by bringing the lips closer of by bringing them together until producing an occlusion; they are the bilabial sounds. The lower lip can come closer, when articulating, to the upper incisor teeth, in this way being articulated the labial-dental sounds. With the tip of the tongue leaning against and between the upper incisor teeth and the lower incisor teeth, there are produced the interdental consonants. By leaning the tip of the tongue against the internal part of the upper incisor teeth, there are articulated dental consonants. By touching with the tongue's tip the first area of the palate, immediately in the upper part of the teeth's unveiled area, there are articulated the alveolar consonants, called like this for they correspond to the alveolar area of the teeth. By pushing the tongue towards the palate's front area, there are produced the prepalatal consonants. A special type of prepalatal are the cerebral and the cacuminal (also called as retroflex). If one touches with his tongue's tip the middle of the palate, he can articulate consonants called as medial-palatal or simply palatal. Rarer are the post-palatal sounds, which are articulated by pushing the tongue towards the posterior part of the palate. Even further back are articulated the sounds called as velar or guttural, which the posterior part of the tongue comes closer to the palatal veil and it touches it. Finally, we have uvular sounds, which the uvula touches the tongue's root in, sound which are characteristic to the Semite *languages*, and the laryngeal sounds, articulated by narrowing the larynx. There are also lateral sounds, which the tongue leans on a side of the palate and it lets the air going out through the other side (Coșeriu 1999: 113-114)

Regarding the articulation mode, we must consider diverse factors. Firstly, if in the production of a sound there vibrate or not the vocal cords. The sounds produced by or accompanied by a vibration of the vocal cords are called as sonorous sounds; the sound which the vocal cords do not vibrate in, they are called as deaf sounds (we must highlight that here is also about a physiological sonority, and not only by an acoustic sonority, because from acoustic point of view all the sound are "sonorous", purely for sounding as such). The second fact which we have to bear it in mind, it is the function which the nasal cavity has it in phonation: if the palate's veil closes the communication with the nasal cavity and the exhaling current crosses only through the buccal cavity, we have the so-called nasal sounds. Finally, the consonant sounds can be followed by an inhaling (a small noise produced by the air's crossing through larynx), and in this case they are called as aspirated (th, dh, ph, bh, kh, gh etc.) (Coșeriu 1999: 103)

Close syllables	Close syllables are called the syllables ending in a consonant (Coșeriu 1999: 125)
Code: Jakobson	At Jakobson appears, of course, the system too, the "*language*", in other words the key available both to the emitter and to the recipient – or, at least, which should mostly be available to both of them -, in order to cypher and decipher the message. By correlating himself to the communication theory, Jakobson calls this element as code (Coșeriu 2013: 89-90)
Cognitive function of the *language*	The cognitive function of the language it is exercises when it take place "the internal speaking" of the *language* and the source it becomes its own receptor. This gains a special importance in the case of the reasonings. The cognitive *language* can appear also in written form, for the act itself of elaborating the material it makes possible a better evaluation of the data and a more convincing placing a parts of a discourse (Nida 2004: 64)
Collections of functional *languages*	The Romanian language, the Spanish language, the Italian language, the French language etc. as they are generally understood, they do not directly function in discourses, by not being, consequently, functional *languages*: they are "collections" of functional *languages*, which a functional *language* is a form of the Romanian language, of the Spanish language, of the Italian language, of the French language etc. (Coșeriu 2000: 269)
Common *language*	The *language* with "supra-regional" and supra-dialectal use (Coșeriu 2000: 264)
Commutation (the principle of the functionality / structuralism)	The methodological or technical corollary of the functionality's principle it is, as I said, the commutation. Given the solidarity between the expression's plan and the plan of the *language*'s content, the technique applied in order to identify the differential elements and, through their mediation, the functional units, it is that of substituting (of "commuting") an element in an empirical given unit of the expression – on the purpose of observing if, by doing that, there will occur a change in content, and vice versa, of substituting an element in a given unit of the content, on the purpose of observing if by doing so something will be modified on the expression's plan. If on the other plan too, there takes place a change, that is an indicator that a functional limit has been exceeded and it has been crossed to another unit, namely the difference introduced by us it represents a distinctive element in the respective *language*. If, on the opposite, on the other plan nothing happens, that will be an indicator that the introduced modification isn't functional and that we will continue to be in front of the same *language* unit. Consequently, given two (or more) expression elements (or content elements) identifiable as such, by using the commutation text we can verify whether or not they are functional in the *language* we which are describing, namely if necessarily correspond to them different elements on the other plan too. And that, of course, it doesn't mean that through this immediately and on each case would be discovered the elements of the sought after units, because of existing elements

	functioning as differentials in some units and not functioning as such in other units; only by applying this technique to all the possible units of a system, we can know which the differential elements of that system are, and we can differentiate other units which we haven't differentiated on the first moment (Coșeriu 2000: 182-183)
Comparative-historical linguistics	It should explain the *languages* by making their history (Coșeriu 2000: 11-12)
Compared dialectology	There have been done studies of Romance compared dialectology, mainly regarding the historical relations amongst the Italian dialects and the dialects of other Romance countries (Coșeriu 1999: 97)
Compared grammar	If the study of the *languages* is extended upon several systems united in groups or in "families" of *languages* according to the "kinship" relations (their provenance out of a unique original *language* or, better said, the fact that those *languages* represent distinct forms in space and in time or one and the same original *language*), this is called as compared grammar (for instance: the compared grammar of the Romance languages, or the compared grammar of the Indo-European languages- of the linguistics). The compared grammar can also be understood as synchronic discipline (the simple comparison between diverse systems at a given moment or outside the time), but, by and large, it is rather a science of historical character, applying alternatively two points of view: the retrospective one (from the present or historical *languages* down to the "common language", older or prehistorical) and the prospective one (from the common language up to the differentiated systems which have come out of this one) (Coșeriu 1999: 97)
Compartments in the general structure of the *language-use*	On universal level, the *language-use* considered as activity it is the speaking (by and large) undetermined historically, considered as technique, so, "to know how to speak, generally" (elocution competence); when considered as a product, the *language-use* it is the "speaking", the totality of what has been said (or of what one could say, on the condition of being considered as "done thing". On individual level, the *language-use* as activity is the "discourse", namely the linguistic act (of the series of related linguistic acts) belonging to a certain individual in a given situation; from the competence point of view, the *language-use* is expressive competence (the knowledge regarding how to elaborate the "discourses", and as product the *language-use* is a text (spoken or written). Analogically, on historical level, the *language-use* as activity it is the concrete *language* as manifested in speaking, as historical determination of the *language* (for instance: :the Spanish speaking", "the French Speaking" etc.); and as "potency" the *language-use* is the *language* in its quality as traditional knowledge of a community ("idiomatic" competence). As product, instead, the *language* never presents itself in a concrete form, because on this level everything is "produced" (it is created), or it

	remain in a stage of hapax (expression said only once), or, if adopted and historically preserved, it enters as component part of the traditional competence. In this case, the *language* never is epyov: epyov, product, it can be only the "abstract" *language*, namely the *language* as deduced from speaking and objectified in grammar and in a dictionary (Coșeriu 2000: 237-238)
Competence: Historical (Linguistic)	The plan of the historical competence doesn't contain only linguistic facts, but it contains other traditions too, referring to "things", to the trans-linguistic world. In order to identify the linguistic knowledge itself, and in order to establish what the description of a *language* must be like, we ought, consequently, to operate a first distinction between knowing the things and the idiomatic competence. Actually, knowing the "things" (including the ideas and the opinions referring to "things") it is often confounded to (or, at least, it isn't distinguished from) the linguistic competence (Coșeriu 2000: 251-252)
Competence: Linguistic	The English speaker and the French speaker know that an analogue function, as that one between predicate and subject, it must be presented in a different manner. This intuition belong to their *language* and to their linguistic competence" (Coșeriu 2000: 221)

The modern speaker (…) conceives the *language* rather as a competence concretized in linguistic acts (the *languages* are "known" and are "spoken"). And the linguists and the grammarians frequently consider the *language* as competence, but also as "abstract" *language*, as "product" (thus, F. de Saussure affirmed that we can have an idea about what effectively is a *langue* through the mediation of a grammar and of a dictionary) (Coșeriu 2000: 239)

And if the historical *language* doesn't correspond to the linguistic competence of the speakers "due to excess" – because of, normally, except some historical *languages* frequently reduced to few functional *languages* (or to a single one), no speaker knows the entire historical language – so that the functional *language* wouldn't correspond "due to deficiency", because of no speaker knowing, at least up to a point, more than one functional *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 271) |
| Concept (the concept) | Buhler referred to the fact that there is said "something about things", and t not that the "things would communicated themselves". Therefore, the report between the material sign, the signifier, and the things, it isn't a direct report, but a report mediated by this "something". We can call this "something" as concept (conceptus), as the scholastics did, by taking it from Stoics: Verba (voces) significant res mediantibus conceptibus. – "The words signify the things through the mediation of the concepts". Still, regarding the scholastic term of conceptus it is not clear on what measure this one is thought as belonging to the |

	language-use. A veritable linguistic analogion is the term signification (Coșeriu 2013: 101-102)
Concept of "text"	As we said, the concept of "text" it isn't identical at all authors, and sometimes it doesn't have the same meaning even to the same author. In an introductive handbook, for instance, we find, as a first definition of the "text", the formulation: " finished linguistic enunciation". In the same introduction, more precisely in a footnote to the previous definition, the following passage is reproduced to us as an ampler definition or, as the author opinions, a more precise one: " The text is a linguistic unit, felt as finished according to the emitters' intention, or to the receivers intention, and built up according to the grammatical rules of the *language* they used" (Coșeriu 2013: 23-24)
Configuration (the concept of…)	To the concept of "configuration" it corresponds, more or less, the notion of "associative field" of Ch. Bally (cf. cap. XI, 1.1.), that one of "notional field" of G. Matore, and that one of "morpho-semantic field" of P. Guiraud -; it is not properly-said "structural". We mention it here only for it has been attributed this meaning (especially regarding the lexicology of G. Matore) and for having the same origin like the concept of "paradigmatic structure", coming, like this one too, out of the "associative relation" of F. de Saussure (Coșeriu 2000: 137)
Connotation (Hjelmslev)	The term connotation isn't, of course, chosen by Hjelmslev in a very uninspired manner, because of the connotation having, partially, a totally different meaning, both in logics and in semiotics. That's why, I prefer the term *evocation* which, I admit that, I use it in a wider sense, as one could partially see until now and as it could be seen even clearer in continuation; the connotation as used by Hjelmslev it refers, so, only to a part of what I understand through *evocation*. The connotation as understood in the special sense which I've just clarified, it is an aspect of the sign's function, which, normally, we aren't aware of. As long as the signs are used in the frame of the systems which they belong to, the connotation of the isolated signs isn't actualized. But this situation can rapidly change, when a sign is used outside its "normal" domain of use (Coșeriu 2013: 111-112). In what concerns the "connotation", with the meaning proposed by Hjelmslev, that one has, in principle, exactly the same validity for the functional *languages* as for the historical *languages*: each sign "connotes" (better said: "evokes") the subsystem which it belongs to. And this subsystem, for instance a regional variant of the common *language*, evokes a certain county, its inhabitants, and all the possible representations, justified or not, which the other members of the linguistic community have about these ones; a stratum of the *language* evokes a certain social environment, and a style of the *language* evokes determined conditions of the speaking. These evocations become operational only in the case of the "linguistic admixture", or more precisely, in the case of

	transferring the linguistic signs from a functional *language* into another that is completely different. If somebody consistently speaks the Bavarian dialect in Bavaria to Bavarian partners of dialogue, then nothing is being evoked; the "connotation" as used by Hjelmslev it, of course, virtually present, but it isn't actualized. Likewise happen the things also in the case of the so-called "popular" stratum of *language*, or in that one of the "familiar" stratum of *language*: the determinations as " popular" or "familiar" activate always the corresponding element of *language* only when "seen from outside", from instance form the perspective of the prescriptive norm but not also in the interiority of the functional *language* itself, which they belong to. The "connotation" understood so, which is therefore based on the lack of homogeneousness of the historical *languages*, it is used in several linguistic communities expressly on stylistic purposes – and not only in literature (Coșeriu 2013: 118).
Connotational *language*	The languages whose plan of expression assumes a sign character, being, therefore, the "*language*" itself, have been called by Hjelmslev as connotational *languages* [konnotationssprog, semiotically connotative] (Coșeriu 2013: 151)
Connotative function	To the Buhler's function of appeal it corresponds the connotative function (Coșeriu 2013: 90)
Consonantal mutation	The consonantal mutation (Lautverschiebung) characterizing the Germanic *lnaguages* (in the Germanic *languages* the unvoiced Indo-European occlusives have been transformed in fricatives; the sonorous occlusives, in unvoiced; and the aspired sonorous, in non-inspired sonorous: cf. Lat. Genu – Germ. Knie, Lat. Caput – Germ. Haupt, Lat. hostis ; Germ. – Gäsi; it took place when the Germanic peoples moved from plain to mountainous areas, a fact that required a different kind of articulation; somebody affirmed – and it wasn't a joke – that the differences between German and French are due mainly to the fact that the Germans drink beer, and the French drink wine (Coșeriu 1999: 77)
Consonants	The sounds which aren't produces as the vowels are (see in the present dictionary the definition of the vowels, E. l. t.'s n.) (Coșeriu 1999: 111) In the case of the consonants, instead, the sound is produced right on the place where the partial or total closure of the phonator apparatus it takes place. If the occlusion is total, the produced sounds are the occlusives, also called as explosives, for they are emitted through an "explosion" of the air from the respiratory flow; they can be, depending on what the vocal cords vibrate like, sonorous or deaf, and according to the articulation place they can be: labial, dental, alveolar, palatal, velar, uvular, and laryngeal (Coșeriu 1999: 116)
Contact environment (Jakobson)	The environment which is transmitted the information to (…), having the role of making possible to the emitter to enter the communication with the recipient. This contact channel is, of

	course, especially important when it doesn't take places a direct communication, when the discussions partners communicate with one another rather indirectly, through written texts, on the phone, and likewise (Coșeriu 2013: 89)
Content's substance	The content's substance is, therefore, connotative, on the extent which the designated objects and the situations can evoke something (Coșeriu 2013: 154)
Context	The psychologists, and amongst them especially the behaviorists, who call as "context' any ensemble of facts and which are usually in a necessary relation or, at least, in a usual relation, they consider as "signs" the facts of a "context" themselves, on the measure which the presence of one of them it requires in, the possibility or the necessity of appearing also another / other facts, belonging to the same "context" (Coșeriu 1999: 19-20)

Through "context" we understand the purely linguistic environment of the sign within text, namely what have been already said and – we admit that not always – what is more to say (Coșeriu 2013: 137)

Through context I understand the entire reality that surrounds a sign. At its turn, that reality can be formed of signs and even of "non-signs" (Coșeriu 2013: 140) |
| Context free ("in a free of context form") | In addition to the theory or to the philosophy of the language, the grammar had the task to describe a *language* independently of the circumstances which that *language* it used in, or, as they often say in nowadays, "in a form free of context": context-free (Coșeriu 2000: 14) |
| Context types | a) the idiomatic context, namely the language itself which one speaks into. All the signs of a language used into an act of speaking are in a relation in absentia (Latin) with the other bearer of signs elements of the same language;
b) the verbal context, namely the text itself in its quality of "frame" of each of its component parts;
c) the extraverbal context, constituted of all the non-linguistic circumstances, directly perceived by speakers or already known about them.
The last two context types are especially important for understanding the mode which the meaning is born in, inside the texts (Coșeriu 2013: 140-141) |
| Contextual determination | "Contextual determination" (letting aside the extralinguistic concepts) it means determining a unit through other units, namely a reciprocal determination amongst the units materialized in a linguistic act or "discourse" (Coșeriu 2000: 167) |
| Contextual facts | Using the contextual facts – in this case, the relation agent and his own body – it is accomplished, consequently, in a different manner, in all of the three languages. The facts of this genre haven't been studies enough until now; that's why, one of the difficulties, and not only a theoretical one, but also a practical one, |

	of the descriptive grammar (applied in teaching the foreign languages), for instance, it is that appearing when we must indicate on what measure it is possible (or it is needed) to employ extralinguistic relations and circumstances, while speaking or writing into another language (Coșeriu 2000: 242)
Continuous sounds	Are continuous the prolongable sounds (Coșeriu 1999: 119)
Contrastive grammar	In the practice itself of teaching the foreign *languages*, referring to the expression plan, they firstly insists upon the functional (phonematic) differences, between the taught *language* and the students' maternal *language*, and the "substantial" (phonetic) differences are taught in the frame of the functional differences, and are interpreted as secondary relating to these ones. In what regards the content's plan, the fact - already noticed by Humboldt – that the languages do not differ only by their material aspect but, also, and first of all, through the specific organization of their content (grammatical and lexical), it has become, rightfully, a didactical axiom, at least in teaching the grammar, though it is much less so in teaching the lexicon. Thus, it is remarked from the beginning that the functions of some *languages* can be very different, and the worst way of learning – or the way of not learning – a foreign *language* it is that consisting of searching for functions similar to our *language*. Actually, if it is true that our *language*, by the fact itself that it is *language*, namely it is a system having a certain structure, it offers us the possibility of understanding other *languages*, we will have not to forget that those ones represent other systems, having other structures. It will be very difficult to learn foreign languages to the persons who strive on each step to translate literarily, and instead of learning the foreign *language*'s contents as such (as being other contents), they ask for how it is expressed in the foreign *language* the contents of their *language*, or they lament that they cannot express the same signified (Coșeriu 2000: 69)
Contrastive linguistics	Comparing the translation units to the two codes (Nida 2004: 23)
Coordination (of the levels of the idiomatic structuring)	In the case of the coordination it is about the general possibility of combining units of the same rank in a more complex unit, which then functions on the same level as its component parts. Here too, we can find interesting differences between *languages* (Coșeriu 2013: 221)
Corpus	Ensemble of elements (texts, enunciations etc.) which the research of a phenomenon it is leaning on, and which serve as basis of examples and arguments to the affirmations from a work (Lungu-Badea 2003: 42)
Correct or incorrect affirmation on historical / idiomatic level	Let's come back again on the historical level, which the idiomatic knowledge corresponds to. On this level we speak about linguistic correctness. And affirmation will be correct if it corresponds to the rules of a certain *language* (Coșeriu 2013: 73)

Creating signification	Creating signification is knowledge and uniting the significations with a signified or another, namely transforming the significations in contents of "signs" it is a mode of materializing them and of making them objective (Coșeriu 2009: 47)
Creole *languages*	The creole *languages* are common *languages* insufficiently learnt by the indigenous populations, especially in the colonized territories, and which preserve forms, words, and constructions belonging to *languages* which they replace (for instance, the French *language* of the black people from Haiti, especially of the inferior social classes; the Portuguese *language* of a certain African population etc.) (Coșeriu 1999: 46)
Cultural communities	To each cultural community it corresponds a certain degree and a certain culture patrimony which, in a way or another, are certainly reflected in *language* (Coșeriu 1999: 57)
Cultural research regarding the *language-use*	By and large, the cultural research regarding the *language-use* can be done globally for an entire system or, a contrary, in the beginning it must be done for each word separately, for each words has its own history; later on, there can be established linguistic-cultural isoglosses which will reveal us the measure of the cultural influences amongst *languages*. Sometimes, as I have affirmed, the cultural influence coincides to the forma influence: there is taken a word as phonic fact and as signifying fact (Coșeriu 1999: 60-61)

D

Danish School	The Danish School can be considered as constituted in the year 1931, since the founding of the Linguistic Circle from Copenhagen. At the beginning, in conformity with the traits of the common activity of Viggo Brøndal and L. Hjelmslev, the basic orientation was called generically as "structuralism". Since the year 1935-1936, though, it was increasingly more identified to the linguistic doctrine of Hjelmslev, to glossematics. To the glossematics school belonged H.J. Uldall, J. Hoit – who occupied himself especially with the formal study of the signified ("pleremic") -, P. Diderichsen, the specialist on Romance languages K. Togeby, author of a grammar, mostly glossematic, of the French language, M. Spang-Hanssen, and the great phonetician Eli Fischer-Jorgensen. This, in a very broad sense, because each of the respective scholars had, also, personal conceptions differing from the ones of Hjelmslev and even contrary to his doctrine, some of them accepting the glossematics only by and large, and only as "work hypothesis". More strictly glossematicians are Uldal and Hoit; but even Uldal, who for many years he contributed to the elaboration of the theory, now he sustained a glossematics partially differing form that of Hjelmslev

	(Coșeriu 2000: 115-116)
Delimiting the "*language-use*" object	Delimiting the "*language-use*" object it is mutually assumed by the general linguistic and by the theoretical linguistics, while in philosophy of the *language-use*, this delimitation is raised on the rank of problem. Thus, one can affirm, depending on the adopted research direction, that the linguistic disciplines end there where the *language-use's* philosophy starts, and vice versa (Coșeriu 2011: 41)
Denotative *language*	At Hjelmslev, the *language* is interpreted, in the first place, as a denotative system, therefore, in the sense of the representation function; in addition to that, he expressly referred also to possibility of interpreting the *language* as a non-denotative system of signs. Through denotative *language* [denotationssprog], Hjelmslev understands a system of signs, within which neither the expression nor the content – as considered separately – do not have a sign function; the sign function exclusively consists of reciprocally involving both plans. The expression is an expression of the content, and the content is a content of the expression, ant that, of course, must mean that both plans would be configured in an isomorph mode. Briefly, the "connotative *language* " of Hjelmslev it is exactly what one understands, "normally" by "*language*", if we let aside the aspects we've just talked about (Coșeriu 2013: 151)
Dependency grammar	This grammar of "dependency" focusses upon the syntagmatic functions, whilst the contents "of *language*" can be eliminated as such and with exactness only in the frame of the syntactic paradigms (Coșeriu 2000: 158)
Depth structures	These non-ambiguous expressions represent, according to the transformational grammar, the so-called depth structures. Consequently, the objective genitive and the subjective genitive imply two different "depth structures", and interpreting them it depends on the relations characterizing those "depth structures", these ones being transformed in an identical "surface structure". In the case which we are examining here, the "surface structure" is semantically ambiguous, and according to the transformational grammar, this fact can be explained only relatedly to two different "depth structures". It is supposed, consequently, that the speakers are aware of the two linguistic structures: the surface structure – effectively presented – and the profound structure which, as such, it remains implicit, but which the first structures refers to. The two structures can be (under syntactic aspect) similar or different (Coșeriu 2000: 222-223)
Description	Ascertaining the actual distribution of the forms on the geographical space (Coșeriu 2000: 76)
Description object of the structural linguistics	The object, by excellence, of the structural description it is constituted of the *language* as synchronic technique of the discourse. But, in a historical *language* (the *language* has been historically constituted as ideal unit, being identifiable as such by its own speakers, and by the speakers of other *languages*, usually

through the mediation of a "proper" adjective: Romanian, Spanish, Italian, French, etc.) this technique is never homogenous. A contrary: it usually is a quite complex system of linguistic traditions historically convex, but different and only partially concordant. In other words, a historical *language* always presents internal variety; rightly so, in such a *language*, usually, there are internal differences, more or less profound, corresponding to three fundamental types: a) diatopic differences, namely corresponding to the geographical space (…); b) diastratic differences, namely differences amongst the social-cultural strata of the linguistic community; and c) diaphasic differences, namely differences amongst diverse types of expressive modalities (…). The linguistic differences which – at the same social-cultural stratum – characterize "biological" groups (men, women, children, youngsters) and professional groups, they can be regarded too, as "diaphasic" (Coșeriu 2000: 264)

The specific object of the linguistic description conceived as structural and functional description, it is, precisely, the "functional *language*" – we repeat it, a sole "dialect", considered on a certain "level" and not in a certain "style of *language*" -, because only in the frame of such a *language*, and not in the whole historical *language*, are valid univocally the oppositions, the structures, and the functions ascertained in an idiomatic tradition, as also their systematic connections (despite the fact that an opposition, a structure, or a function, they can be common to several functional *languages*). Being about, instead, a historical *language*, the structural description should be done separately for each one of the functional *languages* distinguished in this: to a "collection" of functional *languages* it should, rigorously speaking, to correspond a "collection" of descriptions. In this sense, the structural description cannot be only synchronic (as it is admitted, by and large), but it must be (as it is necessary in reality) in equally syn-topic, syn-strata, and syn-phasic: when we speak about the "structural grammar of the English *language*" ("of the Spanish", "of the French", "of the Italian"), in reality we always understand "a certain type of English" ("of Spanish", of "French", "of Italian") (Coșeriu 2000: 269)

Descriptive grammar	It is the scientific grammar, it is limited to recording and describing a system in all its aspects (and in all its variety), without claiming that it offers a "model" of *language* or an "exemplary *language*" (Coșeriu 1999: 99) To a language it refers, actually, the descriptive grammar, whose role is, amongst others, that one of "describing" the verbal categories characteristic to the respective *language*, namely to identity these categories and to establish the material schemes of their expression (operations, otherwise, autonomous) (Coșeriu 2000: 74)

Descriptive linguistics	Namely a discipline which to explain on each case the "speaking' by describing the *language*", the system represented by the speaking as according to which is led the speaking (Coșeriu 2000: 11)
Designation (linguistically)	The designation is the reference to "reality", namely the relation in each case determined by a linguistic expression and a "real" "situation", between the sign and the denoted "thing". The designation can correspond to a signified of the *language* which represents its possibility), but it also can not to correspond to the respective signified and to be "metaphorical"(Coșeriu 2000: 274) The designation is, thus, a possibility of the *language-use* based on the *language-use* as signification. And the designation is what leads us through the things' world which, consequently, as "structured" world (differentiated in "things classes") it can be perceived only through the mediation of the *language-use* (Coșeriu 2009: 48) The totality of the functions of the *language-use*, of the speaking, by and large, namely the totality of the functions regarding the designation of the objects and of the states from the "world", it can be considered as a linguistic content. This is the type I call as designation (Coșeriu 2009: 47)
Development of the *languages*	Studying the *languages'* development implicitly puts us the general problem of the linguistic change and of its "causes" (or, better said, of its motivation), a problem in whose examining there have been made many mistakes, especially due to a inadequate approach and, actually, due to a basic error in the mode of considering the *language-use*. As a matter of fact, searching for the "causes" of the linguistic changes it often implies considering the *language* as something static, as something that "should not change" and which any change would need a causa explanation in. Namely it implies a fundamentally wrong consideration of the *languages* as autonomous, independent organisms, independent of the individual speakers , and not as systems constituted on the basis of the concrete linguistic acts, act of complex nature and in which, as we have seen, it is a normal thing the lack of coincidence between expression and understanding, and between creation and the model implied by it. An adequate consideration of the linguistic act as creation act, it somehow implied the elimination of the general problem of the linguistic change, as being an inconsistent problem, given the fact that the change belongs by excellence to the *language-use*: and this is an axiomatic fact. If we must search for something, those will rather be the motivations (Coșeriu 1999: 76)
Deviation	The "deviation" is a relational concept. One operating with this term must be able to indicate also its applicability domain, he must say what we are deviating from. If all the texts have meaning, then the fact itself of the deviation from a norm can be, obviously,

	bearer of the meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 84)
Diachronic grammar	The study of the development of a linguistic system across time (Coșeriu 2000: 98)
Diachronic phonology	It has mostly substituted the historical phonetics (Coșeriu 2000: 68)
Diachronic science (of the language)	The study of the linguistic facts examined "during" time or in their historical development (Coșeriu 1999: 73)
Diachronicity (diachrony) (of the language)	Historical evolution, unfolding, of an event; research method studying the evolution in time of the phenomenon (www.Dex.ro)
Dialect	A dialect is the system of isoglosses of a region, delimited on the basis of purely conventional criteria (though objective), namely by taking in account only some characteristic phenomena. The dialects number from a system of dialects ("*language*") can, consequently, to vary according to the phenomena and to the regions taken in consideration (Coșeriu 1999: 35)
	Inside dialects one can distinguish minor systems of isoglosses, conventionally called as subdialects or local speaking (…) on the basis of purely persona criteria (Coșeriu 1999: 35)
	The *languages*, at their turn, they present differentiations from geographical-spatial point of view (dialects) (Coșeriu 1999: 92)
Dialectics	The dialectics, which, actually, it doesn't belong to our theme, it was conceived as a study for a certain use of the *language* in science – or, as they called it them, of course, not without a reason, a use of the *language* in searching for the truth. That's why, the dialectics is presented as some kind of theory of the scientific *language-use* and of the scientific discussion. It is mainly about how certain these are formulated and about what these theses can be defended against objections like. Thus it is explained the term thesis too, a term employed with the meaning of "scientific work", "PhD work", which remained in use, in the Romance *languages* countries, up to these days. At origin, this thing meant that a thesis was defended against some eventual opponents; in the case of the traditional use of the dialectics it was explicitly about fictive opponents, which presented formulations as "to this could be brought the following objections" etc. In numerous countries, for a long time, the dissertations were written in this dialogical style. An example in this sense is the Kierkegaard's thesis (Coșeriu 2013: 30)
Dialectology	The discipline studying the regional differentiation of a *language* and, in the same time, the diverse minor systems which can be distinguished inside a *language* from geographical point of view, it is the dialectology. In addition to the fact that it represents the study of the spatial variety of a certain *language*, the dialectology can be also the compered science of the dialects of diverse

	languages belonging to the same "family" (Coșeriu 1999: 97)
Diaphasic differences (of historical *language*)	Diaphasic differences, namely differences amongst diverse modalities of expression (…) The linguistic differences which – on the same social-cultural stratum – they characterize "biological" (men, women, children, youngsters) and professional groups, they can be considered as "diaphasic" to (Coșeriu 2000: 264) The diaphasic differences – according to communities – they can be notable, for instance, between the spoken *language* and the written *language*, between the "usual" *language* and the literary language, between the familiar way of speaking and the "public" way of speaking (or, eventually, solemn), and between the current and the administrative *language-use*. In the literary *language* there can be sensitive differences between poetry (in verses) and prose, between the epic poetry and the lyrical poetry etc. (Coșeriu 2000: 266)
Diastratic differences (of historical *language*)	Diastratic differences are differences amongst the social-cultural stratums of the linguistic community (Coșeriu 2000: 246) The diastratic differences are especially noticeable in the communities where there are great cultural differences amongst diverse social structures, as also in the societies differentiated in castes (Coșeriu 2000: 265)
Diatopic differences	The diatopic differences are universally known in what concerns the level of the popular *language* ("dialectal"), which in the European languages, especially, in some communities (as there would be the Italian one, the French one, or the German one), really, very obvious, but such differences exist also on the level of the common *language* (the *language* of "supra-regional" and supra-dialectal use) (Coșeriu 2000: 264) (of historical *language*) Namely differences in the geographical space (Coșeriu 2000: 264)
Discourse	The individual form of the *language-use* itself (Coșeriu 2009: 333)
Discourse's linguistics	Along with the *languages*' linguistics, there is room for a linguistics of the speaking, as also for a linguistics of the discourse (or of the text), which are equally necessary for an effective understanding of the *language-use* (necessary, as well, in order to better understand the functioning of the *languages* as such) (Coșeriu 2000: 239)
Discourse's universe	In total opposition to the historical languages, the texts are conditioned by the universe of the discourse (…) there isn't any "special" language ((…) in the sense of a "technique of the speaking constituted and transmitted historically') for mythology, for science, or for literature, but the discourse's universe it is, on each time, completely different; and affirmation done inside mythology, inside science, or inside history. Observation

regarding Christopher Columbus have a totally different meaning, and the truth value of an affirmation as: " Penelope was Ulysses' wife" can be verified only within the universe of the speaking which it belongs to. The same thing is valid for what is fiction in literature. This diversity of the universes of the speaking affects, though only the texts, and not the languages too (Coșeriu 2013: 69)

Through universe of the discourse I mean the universal system of significations, which a text belongs to, and which the text can gain its validity and it specific meaning through (Coșeriu 2013: 140)

This term means: "the universal system of significations" which a text belong to, and which a text gains it validity and its specific meaning through. Any form of interpreting the world, any individual coherent mode of speaking about the world, it represents such a system. It can be about mythology – understood here not in its quality as cultural extraverbal context, but as a specific mode on speaking about a context of the world -, about mathematics and, of course, also about the universe of our daily practical experience. The mythology, the literature, the science, the mathematics, our practical world, all of these represent such discursive universes, to the extent that they can be "themes" and "reference systems" for our discourse. A construction as that of reducing the object to subject, it makes sense within philosophy, but not in grammar too (Coșeriu 2013: 146-147)

Discrete indication	Acts of speaking as the allusion, the insinuations, or the suggestion, namely the "discrete indication", they often function on the basis of such "omitted lacunas" within text, recognized by the text's interpreter, according to the circumstances, as presuppositions of the already said things, as something which must be mutually "completed" (Coșeriu 2013: 142)
Discursive context	One of the most important differences between the written *language* and the spoken *language* it consist of the fact that the first one, unlike another, it cannot simply use all the possible extraverbal contexts, but it must create a part of these contexts only with the help of the discursive context. The extraverbal contexts are partially produced, only for once, in the text itself, and then they are employed, as in the spoken language, only on the purpose of other determinations (Coșeriu 2013: 149)
Distinction between *fable* and *subject*	The explicit distinction made by the Russian linguists – but intuitively known from before – between *fable* and *subject*, namely between "real" facts constituting, in a way, the raw material of a discourse and their elaboration in the discourse itself, it has allowed, amongst others, to be identified with greater precision and clarity the procedures applied in discourses, especially in the narrative discourse. Firstly, one can attribute a figurative function to the discourse's dimensions themselves, by making to coincide the duration of the linguistic expression to the

	duration of the narrated or presented facts (Coșeriu 2009: 349)
Distinction between functional *language* and historical *language*	"Functional *language*", the specific object of the structural linguistics (also of the generative-transformational grammar), it mustn't be confounded to the "historical" *language*, this one being an ensemble, a collection of techniques (consequently, also much more complex than the functional *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 280)
Distinction between general linguistics and the theory of the *language-use*	The general linguistics ascertains what is general, and the theory of the *language-use* it proposes what should be considered as universal (Coșeriu 2011: 40)
Distinction between generality / universality	A distinction ignored by the positivist ideology. The generality represents the ensemble of the constant particularities on which, by already having the concept, we effectively ascertain them in am objects class; characteristic traits which, rigorously, they can be non-indispensable in order the object to be what they are: simply, those traits occur in them. The universality, instead, it is the condition for ascertaining the common traits in objects, the necessary mode of being of certain objects: what belongs to the concept of an object or what can be deduces out of concept, namely the ensemble of those traits which an object wouldn't be without, what it is. And these traits do not need to be abstracted on the basis of the observation, for we previously know that they are present in objects; if there had been the contrary case, the objects wouldn't have been what they are. Without any doubt, when we explicitly attribute some traits to the universality of diverse object, we can be wrong (Coșeriu 2000: 38)
Distinction between *image / word*	The image – which reproduces the facts – it remains image even if inversed; but the words isn't image: it is a sign or, except the special cases, it is another sign and, thus, it represents, at its turn, the direction belonging to any sign of this type. So, when speaking about this, we cannot avoid the oriented linearity of the "things'" time, because we cannot avoid the oriented linearity of the speaking (Coșeriu 2009: 351)
Distinction between *language* and speaking	Another distinction having also very old roots in tradition (this time even in the intuitive knowledge of the language) it is the so essential and the current in the present linguistics, distinction between *language* – as technique of speaking or linguistic competence – and the speaking as materialization of a linguistic technique, or the concrete linguistic activity: in Saussurian terms, between *langue* and *parole* or, with the terms explicitly used by Noam Chomsky, between competence and performance (Coșeriu 2000: 9)
Distinction between *language-use* and *metalanguage-use*	A second very important distinction which we must made – and right in the domain of the linguistic competence – it is the distinction between *language-use* and *metalanguage-use*. Through "*metalanguage-use*" we understand a *language-use* (a linguistic use) whose object is a *language-use* too; for instance, speaking about words or about phrases. The "*language-use*" or, better said,

110

	the primary *language-use* it is a *language-use* whose object isn't, at it turn, a *language-use* too. As I said before, this distinction can be found already expressed in *De magistro* by Saint Augustine (Coșeriu 2000: 255)
Distinction between philological fact and linguistic facts	It is opportune, without any doubt, to distinguish between the philological facts and the properly-said linguistical facts, but it is necessary too, to specify which are the limits of the use of cultural extralinguistic facts in the speaking of a certain *language* and in a certain moment that *language*'s history (Coșeriu 2000: 242)
Distinction between positive and negative verbal contexts	In what regards the distinction between the positive verbal context and the negative verbal context, we should firstly notice that, usually, it is mentioned only the existence of the first type. But it seems important to me that even what it hasn't been said, what it has been "left aside", to be considered as a possible context. There are many textual functions referring to something that hasn't been uttered, but which has been somehow indicated (Coșeriu 2013: 141-142)
Distinction between primary *language* and *language-use*	The primary distinction between primary *language* and *meta-language-use* it is not operated inside the *language-use* constituting on the basis of the diverse elements composing the speaking act, but it is rather one of these elements, namely the reality. This distinction classified the facts inside reality, as they belong or not to the *language-use*. No matter how fundamental and indispensable would be in order to discuss several problems, the distinction between the primary *language-use* and the *meta-language-use* it doesn't represent, though, a necessary criterion for distinguishing the diverse functions of the language (Coșeriu 2013: 99-100)
Distinction between synchrony and diachrony	The distinction between synchrony and diachrony – and in practice, between the synchronic study and the diachronic study of the linguistic acts – it occurred, as mentioned before, already at Fr, Thurot, at the end of the XVIII Century, and later in the prologue to the Grammar of Andres Bello. Despite all these, there cannot be established a direct relation between the principle affirmations of these two authors. Instead, in the present linguistics it is effectively presents a continuity of these themes, a continuity which is manifested, though, only inside this linguistics, because reaffirming of some similar principles it doesn't constitute an intentional or historically motivated turning back (Coșeriu 2000: 19) An essential distinction inside the primary language (but which can be done also in the case of the *meta-language-use*'s grammar(it is the distinction which must be operated between synchrony and diachrony, namely between the *language* on a given moment of its historical development (considered in its functioning in speaking) and the *language* "across the time", namely in its historical development. It is about a well-known distinction and we aren't going to insist here upon it, and we only signal that

describing a *language* is, of course, "synchronic", in the sense that the *language* is considered in its functioning (and not in its historical becoming). Furthermore, it is appropriate us to make the distinction between the state of real *language* and the synchrony considered as an ideal and, to say so, "absolute". Besides, in the *language* state too, there is a diachronic dimension, for the speakers consider certain forms and constructions as outdated or, a contrary, as recent, and by using them, they take in account these values in order to give an archaic nuance or a nuance of "modernity" to their discourse. (…) Especially when a literary tradition of the *language* penetrates into the spoken language, it is remarked the simultaneous presence of two or more states in the same "*language* state", simultaneity which, actually, it reflects the development itself of the *language*, its continuously "changing" (Coșeriu 2000: 38)

It is, on the other hand, about a "subjective" diachrony, or a "diachrony of the speakers" (intuited as such by the speakers themselves) and which can be totally different from the diachrony which an historian of the *language* could establish it (Coșeriu 2000: 258-259)

In discussing the Saussurian distinction between synchrony as "state" and diachrony as "development" of the *language* (or, better said, in the Saussurian interpretation of this distinction) H. Schuchardt observed that it is about two inseparable dimensions and he affirmed that, in language, only the movement is real and only the non-movement, the staticity, it is perceivable and controllable. Or, the history has the purpose of showing just the unity between synchrony and diachrony and to make known the *language*'s dynamism (Coșeriu 2009: 335)

Distinction between the sign's substance and form (linguistic)	We are going to make now distinction – always on the expression's plan, namely in the sphere of the signifiers – between the sign's substance and form (Coșeriu 2013: 124)
Distinction between the syn-practical frame and the sin-physical frame	Karl Buhler introduces a supplementary distinction between the syn-practical, the syn-physical, and the syn-semantical frames. By "syn-semantical" frame we must understand at him the properly-said extralinguistic context, namely the context in a usual sense, while the syn-practical frame corresponds, approximately, to the "situation" in the usual acceptation, but by no means to the "situation" as understood in the strict sense which I am soon going to speak about; this is for with this precise meaning, the "situation" occurs at Buhler, but in a totally different context. The novelty itself at Buhler, it is presented by the syn-physical frame, which partially corresponds to what I am going to call in continuation as physical context (Coșeriu 2013: 47)
Distributional method	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000)

Domain	Through domain I refer myself to the region which the designated itself is a familiar object in, form the daily life of the speakers; the domain's limits are, therefore, general-cultural, and not linguistic. The region which an object as "house" is known in, it represents, so, a domain delimited by other domains which the same objects are unknown in, but which only some equivalent objects – form functional point of view – are known in, as there are the iglus or the wigwams (Coșeriu 2013: 134)
Duration / quantity	The time interval which the vibrations corresponding to a sound unfold in, it is called as duration and it corresponds from linguistic point of view to the quantity (Coșeriu 1999: 104)

E

Elements of the discourse's meaning	Each one of these "choices" – that one of the elements to be told, as also that one of the narrative rhythm and that one of the narrated facts – it is a constitutive element of the discourse's meaning and it can constitute, eventually, the discourse's key (Coșeriu 2009: 350)
Elocutionary knowledge (of a *language*)	I call elocutionary knowledge that knowledge referring to speaking by and large. It is about a general knowledge about how we speak, about the knowledge, for instance, of the fact that in speaking, we can refer to the things themselves and to the contexts (Coșeriu 2013: 72)
Emic-etic distinction	K.L. Pike (…) tried to apply the principles of the linguistic description to the domain of the "behavior" (of the culture), by operating the distinction, in diverse domains, between "emic" and "etic", namely between what is functional and invariant and what is variable (Coșeriu 2000: 127)
Emotive function	To the Buhler's notification function (Ausdruck) it corresponds, at Jakobson, the emotive function (Coșeriu 2000: 90) In the case of the emotive function, the source has as purpose to modify the emotional state of the receptors. Using the *language* in order to determine the receptors to cry or to laugh, it has an emotive function. In such conditions, the *language* becomes an especially useful instrument for encouraging the solidarity amongst people, to comfort them after a great loss or a great injustice done to them, or, a contrary, in order to irritate them. Often, the quantity of information conveyed through the *language-use* with emotive function it is minimum, because the accent doesn't fall on content but on impression. Consequently, the politicians are especially attracted towards this function, for they can create enthusiasm for their cause, by making minimum promises (Nida 2004: 64-65)

	The emotive function has as purpose to change the emotional state of the receptors and in order to do that it has to depend on a great measure on the connotative value of the words. The emotional language can inspire a fiery faith or it can cause the public's laughter. Successfully using this function it constitutes an unparalleled gift of the talented comedians and of the politicians, which accumulate power by manipulating the masses. The emotive function is the less understood amongst all functions, and it is the most dangerous one. It can have the greatest effect by being, in the same time, the most honored and feared of all functions (Nida 2004: 162)
Empirical universals	Does this mean that the language-use is "natural" per definitionem? From a certain point of view, if it is about its own "empirical universals", about the norm its must respect – even in the mediation of the "nature" -, yes: the norms one expects to be deduced out of languages can be very well considered as internal "naturalness" of the language-use (besides this, to the linguists, it must be valid also the norm resulted through an essential universal, according to which, these norms which should exist in languages they can be "suspended" in individual cases. But not also in a relation with a "nature" considered as "a world of unnamed "things"", obtained through abstraction of through construction outside the frame of the individual languages, because, from this perspective, the language-use is simply a replica created by man to nature and to the world of sensorial perceptions (Coşeriu 2009: 67-68)
English School	The English structuralism comes from M. Sweet, achieving a definitive form since the "phonetic" phonology of D. Jones. The true founder of the "English School" was, though, J. R. Firth, who, since the year 1944 to the year 1956, he occupied the first department of general linguistics created in England (at the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London). The Firth's structuralism (who was at the beginning a faithful follower of Jones) represents a linguistic elaboration of the contextual theory of the signified, sustained by the anthropologist and ethnologist B. Malinowski, and that's why could be called as "situational" or "contextual". Given the fact that is a structuralism of special type, we should characterize it in a more technical manner, by using concepts which we are going to treat in continuation. To this theory, the distinction between "structure" ands "system" is a fundamental one: the "structure" is the syntagmatic or combinatory structure corresponding to the chain of speaking (vid infra), and the "system" is what in other types of structuralism represents the "class" or the "paradigm", namely the ensemble of the elements which can occupy a certain position in a "structure". The determinant fact is, anyway, the "structure", so that in positions different ("situations") occur different "systems"- within each "system", the units interpreted, though, as strictly positive; therefore, if an element "n" opposes, in certain positions

	to "m" and to "n", and in other positions only to "m", it isn't about the same "phoneme". This orientation is represented by W. S. Allen (specialist in classic languages and, especially, in Sanskrit), R. H. Robins (famous specialist in the history of the linguistics), M. A. K. Halliday (knower of the Chinese language), F. R. Palmer, and R. Quirk. Equally belong to the "English School", directly or indirectly relating to Firth, by being influenced by him: W. Hass, the phonetician D. Aber-Crombie, J. Lyons (semantician and author of an excellent handbook of introduction in linguistics), and A. McIntosh. In the same content, C. E. Bazei represents a "skeptic" or "pragmatic" structuralism, because to him the most part of the distinctions and of the notions of the linguistics, they do not refer to facts, but to the criteria applied to the facts. In Firth's case it is about a rather sketched theory, namely undeveloped, and which wasn't applied, excepting what refers to "structures" and especially in phonetics. A "systematic" linguistics in the firth's sense it is being presently developed (it is being elaborated by Halliday). Despite all these, in what has already been accomplished, especially by focusing on "enunciations" and by assuming the structural conception upon signified, the English structuralism present itself clearly as a connection link between the European continental structuralism and the North-American structuralism (Firth himself spoke in this sense about a "Atlantic linguistics") (Coșeriu 2000: 119-120)
Ethnic substratum	Another theory is that of the ethnic substratum which, in its original "biologist" formulation, it belong to the Italian linguist G. I. Ascoli and which has been admitted and discussed seriously, especially, grace to the huge prestige of this scholar. According to this theory it is affirmed that the linguistic change depends, in the last analysis, on the change of the race and on the persistence of the defeated race as substratum of the victorious race, and, with this, on maintain the habits (articulatory and of another nature) characteristic to the defeated *language* as substratum of the victorious *language*. So, for instance, in the case of the Latin, which has been superimposed to other *languages* n Italy, Iberia, Gallia, and Dacia, it would have remained in the physical conformation of these peoples, which are different from racial point of view, which in these regions learnt Latin, a certain inheritance manifested later in the respective Romance *languages*; especially the French "u" (pronounced as "ii") it would be owed to a Celtic atavistic heredity, appeared again in the French *language* two centuries later. Consequently, the original theory of the substratum implied the admission of the existence in *languages* of some laws resembling to the atavistic laws formulated by Mendel, according to which a certain somatic character of a generation it can manifest again in the following generations, a theory presenting a biological explanation absolutely irreconcilable with the conception upon *language-use* as social and cultural phenomenon (Coșeriu 1999: 76-77)

Etymology	Another branch of the lexicology is the etymology, discipline studying the words' history, namely the modifications of form and signified which the words record across time. Consequently, the etymology is in relations, on one hand with the historical phonetics, by applying the data of this discipline to each individual word and, on the other hand, with the historical semantics, which though it doesn't correspond to, given the fact that it doesn't study the directions or the general types of the changes of signified, but it studies the concrete modifications of the signified of some words (Coșeriu 1999: 96)
European Structuralist Schools	Those from: Prague, Geneva, and Copenhagen (at least in their "definitive" form), claim to come from the theory of Saussure – or they adopt modes of approach based on the distinctions formulated (…) especially on the dichotomies: language / speaking, and Synchrony / diachrony, and on the Saussurian notions of functional "difference" and 'opposition" (Coșeriu 2000: 107)
Evocation	The ensemble of these functions, which do not let themselves to be reduced to the representation function, I call it evocation. The evocation contributes extremely much to the *language*'s richness; through vocation it appears that polysemy which shouldn't be always regarded only from negative perspective, as a "lack of clarity", but also from positivist perspective, as an enrichment. The *language-use* theoretician, W. M. Urban [Language and Reality, quoted work, p. 195 and the followings], he very insistently highlighted this enrichment which is based on the *language*'s evocation function, on the possibility of referring to something with the help of the *language* but without specifically speaking about that something (Coșeriu 2013: 150)

As I understand the evocation, the evocation has been treated similarly within a linguistic direction considered as extremely abstract and formalist, which tends, without any doubt, towards a string idealization of the object in discussion and towards reducing the object's domain, shortly, a theory which we could tell about, at a first glance, that it wouldn't occupy itself only with so "marginal" aspects as the avocation. I am speaking about glossematics and, in this sense, especially about the distinctions made by Hjelmslev between denotation and connotation (Coșeriu 2013: 150) |
| Experimental phonetics | The experimental phonetics is a discipline developed during the positivist era, and that assures us that in the real experience doesn't appear in a primary mode homogeneous types of sounds: there aren't two perfectly identical "a" vowels, in the pronunciation of two speakers, and not even in the pronunciation of the same speaker in different circumstances. The sole possible thing is therefore to select the identical traits of these different sounds and to establish thus several classes, one of the "a" sounds, other of the "e" sounds etc. namely to build up types of sounds |

	through some operations of abstraction and generalization. Which is the mode just these classes are delimited in, and why, and not others (in a given language), which is the mode a frontier is drawn in, and why, for instance, between an open "o", a medium "o", and a close "o" – though in the real experience are presented only the gradual differences and not a "continuum" without any sharp division -, this constitutes another problem which the positivist approach doesn't solve it, and neither can solve it because, most often, the effective (implicit) motivation of these delimitations it has a functional character. Despite these, building up the types of d sound through abstracting and generalization it often determines us to attribute similar types to different languages, regardless their functional "statute" (Coșeriu 2000: 26)
Expression's economy theory	The theory of the expression's economy affirms that in languages can be noticed, by and large, the tendency of expressing only what is necessary, what is indispensable, to inter-comprehension. Namely, if in an already given expression we have a plural sign, this one can be considered as sufficient, and other signs of the same function are suppressed as unnecessary (Coșeriu 1999: 87-88)
Expression's form	The expression's form connoted through the diverse numerical relations, as, for instance, the rhythm (Coșeriu 2013: 154)
Expression's substance	The expression's substance connotes, on the expression's plan, by direct imitation (Coșeriu 2013: 154)
Expression-content and form-substance dichotomy	Johansen starts from the double expression-content and form-substance dichotomy, characteristic to the glossematics' approach of the signs systems (…) Both on the expression plan and on the content plan, through "substance" one understands what the sign "really is", as, for instance, a structure sound, a sequence of graphemes or a determined situations, which can be explained and paraphrased. Through "form" one understands on both plans what the sing "isn't", namely the position the sign has in the frame of the ensemble of relations on the basis of which the two plans are constituted. As already at Saussure, both plans are thought as being "solidary", namely they reciprocally imply one another. So, the fact that in analysis and in description we can and we must distinguish between expression and content it doesn't mean that we also could separate the two plans even at the analyzed and described object (Coșeriu 2013: 153)
Expressive knowledge (of a *language*)	This is the knowledge referring to the mode which certain texts are formed in. This expressive knowledge (…) can be, eventually, limited, in our opinion, to very specific texts and it can be unavailable for other types of texts, or to be available only in a reduced measure (Coșeriu 2013: 72)
External factors	As the contacts amongst the diverse languages (Coșeriu 2000: 74)
Extralinguistic contexts	The extralinguistic contexts which we (implicitly) refer to, when we speak, they can have an ampler or a limited validity, and using them and the fact of knowing how to use them belong to the

	universal technique of the *language-use*. Certain context are valid (at least virtually) for the whole mankind: thus, the general context of the experience of living within world and of its "normalness" (Coșeriu 2000: 240)
Extraverbal "natural" context	Through extraverbal "natural" context I understand the whole world which we know, seen as an ensemble of the speaking, namely in the ensemble of the empirical context possible. We speak in this case about everything we know regarding the surrounding nature and about our bodily constitution and about everything we suppose that exists, to a certain degree, known on the moment of the speaking (Coșeriu 2013: 142-143) The historical extraverbal context, or natural, it is present without restrictions in the domain of the written *language* too (Coșeriu 2013: 148)
Extraverbal context	In the frame of the extraverbal context it is about all the circumstances which, on a first level of the analysis, the counterpose to the signs as something external and, concomitantly, they determine more precisely their way of being used. I am saying "on a first level of the analysis", for we must take in account the fact that the "things" can function, occasionally, as symbol and, thus, as "second degree signs" (Coșeriu 2013: 142)
Extraverbal cultural context	Through extraverbal cultural context I understand everything belonging to the community's cultural tradition, no matter if it is about a very small community or about the entire mankind. He belongs, for instance, the mythology, and the totality of the facts known by a community out of the scientists' works and of its writers. There is no mandatorily necessary that the individual author of such a "cultural given" to be known on a general level (Coșeriu 2013: 146)
Extraverbal empirical context	Through extraverbal empirical context I understand the things and the situations known to the interlocutors on the moment and in the place where the peaking takes place. It can be about directly seeable things (if I am affirming now that I am writing something on the board, it won't be necessary to specific what board I am referring to), or about things and situation about whose existence we purely cannot doubt (Coșeriu 2013: 142) An extraverbal empirical context exists in an unmediated manner only for the spoken *language*, the same thing being valid – at least partially – also for the extraverbal practical context or for the occasional context (Coșeriu 2013: 148)
Extraverbal physical context	The extraverbal physical context is constituted of the things which the sign directly adhere to. For instance, a book represents the physical context for the signs forming its title. This type of context corresponds, thus, approximately, to the "physical frame" mentioned by Karl Buhler (Coșeriu 2013: 142)
Extraverbal practical or occasional context	Through extraverbal practical or occasional context I understand the "occasion" of the speaking, the special conjuncture, subjective

	or objective, which the speaking act takes place in. It is, therefore, quite precisely, about what other authors understand through "situation" or, at least, about what they partially understand through this concept. The determinants for this type of context are, for instance, the interlocutors and the precise spatial and temporal conditions of the speaking, which allow us to express ourselves "elliptically" (Coșeriu 2013: 144)

F	

Facticity	(only mentioned, but not defined at Coșeriu 2000: 191) 1. The character of what is factic 2. (philologically) the contingent, free character of the existence the absence of a rational justification (www.Dex.ro)
Facts of speaking	By applying the principle of the universality to the individual fact and in conformity with the speakers' intuitive knowledge, it is discovered – or it is implicitly discovered – in the facts of speaking, practically infinite, the *language*: the value which each of these acts has it in the respective language. In the same time, it is affirmed the *language*'s primate, which isn't arbitrarily built up on the basis of the speaking, but it can be deduced out of speaking, for it is done throughs peaking (Coșeriu 2000: 59)
Facts specific to the plan of the concretizing variants	The diverse "acceptations" of the linguistic forms which the traditional linguistics occupied itself with, and which the neo-grammatic linguistics tried to identify, by reducing them, in each case, to a series of types, they must be considered, consequently, as specific facts of the variants of the concretizing plan's. Even more than that, the reaction types too (even when they correspond, in their extension, to the *language* units) they belong to the same plan of the variants; really, the new and important aspect in the structuralist approach it is that the functional units and the variants are attributed with the two different types of "existence": on one hand, the existence, so to call it, of some unique "models" of existence (in the linguistic competence) and, on the other hand, the existence in their quality as concretizations of these models (in speaking) (Coșeriu 2000: 167)
Field: Associative	The notion of "associative field" belonging to Ch. Bally (Coșeriu 2000: 137)
Field: conceptual	Referring to an extralinguistic reality (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Field: Denotative	Bühler himself distinguishes, on the other hand, in *language-use*, a denotative field, which the signs have only deictic value in, in other words they immediately and directly indicate the "objects" which they refer to (it is the case of the "pronominal" signs, as: this one, that one, here, then, me, you) and a symbolic field, which

	the signs have signifier value, not indicating the object directly, but only through the mediation of a generic mental content (Coșeriu 1999: 93)
Field: Derivational	(…) the derivatives of a linguistic sign, for instance: to teach, teacher… and which also the semantic values of the linguistic unit relate to (Hjelmslev 1969: 78-82, Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 216) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Field: Intonational	The tonality's field of variation, namely the musical distance between the lowest tone and the highest tone of a speaker, it is called as intonation field and it differs depending on *language* (Coșeriu 1999: 105)
Field: Lexical	Out of which is born the derivational field of a sign (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29)
Field: Morphosemantic	Defined by P. Guiraud (Coșeriu 2000: 137)
Field: Notional	Defined by G. Matore (Coșeriu 2000: 137) Matore insists exactly upon these: "the notional fields" aren't the "lexical fields" of the *languages*, but they are contexts of the "things" and notions manifesting in the use of the respective words, in the frame of a certain "ideology" referring to the things themselves (Coșeriu 2000: 138)
Field: Semantic	(…) defined as the ensemble of the lexical units (linguistic signs) denoting kindred concepts, governed at their turn by a single concept (a hyper-name). Ex.: fruit: lemon, orange, apple, prune etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 29) (Notional, Associative) The ensemble of words being in a tight correlation of meaning (www.Dex.ro)
Focusing the attention upon the individual fact	In linguistics "focusing the attention upon the individual fact" it takes in account any fact of speaking, for instance: any sound or any meaning of a form or another. Thus, they frequently insists upon that any pronounced sound is effectively distinct from any other, and this is true, but this fact, as we are going to see, it doesn't imply the fact that there wouldn't exist, in another sense, some units corresponding to the individual sounds, though the sounds are infinitely different. To the positivist linguistics these aren't but classes of real sounds (Coșeriu 2000: 25)
Formal *language-use*	It is used, by and large, in contexts which the speaker addresses himself to an unknown person in (Nida 2004: 37) In some cases there can be made a clear distinction between the two different levels of formal language: "glacial" or "ceremonious" referring to official occasions; and: public annunciations, essays, editorials (Nida 2004: 37)
Formal objects	To the category of the objects which the *language-use* makes available to the science, there belong also the names of formal objects, as circle, straight line, triangle, square etc. (Coșeriu 2011:

	36)
Formalism	The "formalism", already partially previewed by Saussure, it is transparent in other currents too, especially in the techniques of analyze and description of the linguistic facts (and their corresponding "models"), more or less as a mode of conceiving the facts themselves. By and large, it is considered as "form" the structure itself of the relations between "structure" and "function". Sometimes it is explicitly indicated as "form" the ensemble of functional (distinctive) traits of the established units, and as "substance": their undistinctive traits, this representing another mode of indicating the same combination. Regarding the technical formalization, this is, rigorously speaking, a practical means by excellence: the facts and the relations amongst them are substituted for symbols, on the purpose of easily and more surely handling them. It is true that is often forgotten the purely instrumental function which the symbols have even in the mathematical discipline of the models, being made of formalization a purpose in itself. The symbolic notation is transferred also upon the presentation and the discussion of the facts, and that imposes to some works of modern linguistics from the last years an esoteric aspect that, contrary to the expectations, it doesn't facilitate but it rather complicates the understanding belonging to an uninitiated reader (Coșeriu 2000: 73)
Forms of manifestation of the *language-use* phenomenon	a) the *language-use* in general: it is about the "*language-use*" phenomenon in its ensemble, about *language-use* as universe's manifestation form. This is confronted to other manifestation forms, to the thinking, on one hand, and to the objects' world and of the situations, the so-called "extralinguistic reality", on the other hand. It turns out, thus, two possibilities: if the isomorphism of the *language-use*'s structures is admitted, and the isomorphism of the thinking and of the reality as well, then it will be possible to attribute to the *language-use* the "truth"; if this isomorphism is infirmed, if it is doubted the idea that the *language-use*, the thinking and the reality are analogically structured, than the "truth" of the language will necessarily be denied, and that will mean that the *language-use* as means of knowledge it is regarded with skepticism; b) The *language-use* as enunciation: it is about the report between enunciation and situations, respectively states of affairs. If to the two elements it is recognized an analogue structure, then the *language-use* manifested under the form of the enunciation it will be "true"; if the analogy of the structures is denied, than the *language-use* will be "false"; c) The *language-use* in its quality as word: it is here about the problem of the correspondence between word and the object or the situation (respectively, the objects class or the class of situations) which the word designates (Coșeriu 2011: 62-63)
Fragments / temporal segments of the subject	The temporal fragment of the subjects can be arranged in a different order than that which the segmented time of the fable is

	presented in: we can start, for instance, with a moment which a certain character being forty years old, and then to go back on a moment of his childhood, then on a moment when he was forty years old etc. transferring us back and forth toward the chronological order (Coșeriu 2009: 350)
	We can arrange, yes, the subject's segments in an inverse order related to the fable, and to start with the end of it and to finish with the beginning, but we must tell each segment in its own direction (and in the direction of the discourse). We cannot inverse the unique flow line of the speaking, the temporal order of the discourse, which isn't an imagined event, btu it is a taking place event. Therefore we cannot make to coincide (from semiotic point of view) this unfolding event , necessarily, to a fact unfolding on the opposite direction (Coșeriu 2009: 350)
Freedom of the *language-use*	The freedom of the *language-use* is a historical freedom, a man's freedom as historical being (Coșeriu 2009: 52)
French School	Also to Saussure, it related in a certain measure – especially, through the distinction between "language" and "discourse" and through the important granted to the language values, - the research current having its origin in the work and in the didactical activity of G. Guillaume, current which can be considered as a special form of the grammatical structuralism, having many disciples amongst the French and of French origin linguists. Amongst the most "faithful" representatives of this current we mention R. Valin from French Canada (Quebec) and G. Moignet in France. Also to "Guillaume-ism" related B. Pottier, another founder of the structural grammar and one of the most original French structuralists (Coșeriu 2000: 117-118)
Fricatives	If there takes place a certain degree of narrowing of the phonator tube, so that when the respiratory flow passes through, it is produced a friction or an audible friction, the corresponding sounds are called as fricatives, which can be both sonorous and mute and, according to the articulation place, they can be: labial, labio-dental, interdental, palatal, velar etc. (Coșeriu 2009: 15)
Function regarding the code / the meta-linguistic function (Jakobson)	Jakobson established, in addition, a function regarding the code itself: the speaking about the code. According to the usual linguistic terminology, this function is called as meta-linguistic (…). Finally, according to Jakobson, we should take in account a last function, that function referring to the *language-use*, to the *language-use*'s structuring. Just this function is the motif which Jakobson paid all possible efforts form, in order to develop the Buhler's model. He called this function as poetical function (Coșeriu 2013: 91)
	(…) the meta-linguistic function. As we have already presented above (…), the so-called "meta-linguistic function" is only a special case of the *language*-use's objective function of

	designation – of the "referential function", in Jakobson's terminology. We can speak about things in a certain *language*. We call this fact a the primary use of the *language-use*, the object-*language-use* (I personally prefer the term primary-*language-use*). We still can speak about, with the help of the *language-use*, also about the *language-use* itself, about its materiality and even about its contents (Coșeriu 2013: 99)
Functional essence of the linguistic names	In the case of the second aspect of the problems it is about the functional essence of the linguistic signs and, consequently, it is about establishing the corresponding concept, namely it is about delimiting the "name" from "non-name" (very clearly presented only at Aristotle) (Coșeriu 2009: 55)
Functional *language*	An entirely determined linguistic technique (namely unitary and homogeneous) in the three senses – a sole dialect, on a sole level, and in a unique style of *language*, in other words, a syn-topic, syn stratum, and syn-phasic *language* – it can be called as functional *language*. The adjective "functional" it is in this case justified by the fact that only a *language* of this type it effectively and non-mediately functions in discourses (or "texts"). In the same discourse can be presented, without any doubt, diverse functional languages (for instance, in a narrative discourse, an author's form of speaking and a form so speaking of his characters, or diverse modes of speaking characterizing his own characters), but on each point of the discourse it is always and necessarily presented a certain functional *language*. The Romanian *language*, the Spanish *language*, the Italian *language*, the French *language* etc. as they are by and large understood, they do not directly function in discourses, no being, consequently, functional *languages*: they are "collections" of functional *languages*, while a functional *language* it is a certain form of Romanian, of Spanish, of Italian, of English, of French etc. A common *language* strongly unified and rigidly modified (as the "official" French *language*) it comes closer to this aspect, but it doesn't identically correspond to it, because even in such a *language* are present, at least, the "stylistic" differences (Coșeriu 2000: 269)

The functional *language* has, at it has been said, the advantage of being the *language* immediately "concretized" in discourses (or "texts") and of being homogenous (of being, properly-said, "a sole *language*"). On the other hand, form the point of view of a "functional-integral" description, namely of a description which, due to practical exigencies, it aspires to reflect the effective idiomatic competence of the speakers of a historical *language* (or, at least, of an ensemble of real speakers), if presents the inconvenient that of not being easily deduced out of texts and even out of the speaking of an individual, really, though on each point of a text it is concretized a certain functional *language*, the text which concretized a functional *language* – texts, which are in this regard "plurilingual" – are very frequent (Coșeriu 2000: 270) |

Functional opposition	The fundamental and new notion of the structuralism isn't, in reality, that of "functional unit", but just that of "functional opposition" and therefore of "distinctive trait". In the facts themselves, the distinctive traits represent almost a discovery belonging to the structuralism and, in the same time, the foundation of the corresponding method, for the distinctive traits are the ones allowing the crossing from the "external" or relational structure of a system of linguistic units, to the internal of paradigmatic structure of the units themselves. Rightly so, in structuralism isn't about mechanically "classifying" the facts, as, without a serious foundation, it has been said in a recent criticism, but it is about establishing the structure of the functional units and about ordering the "facts" in accordance with that, in the system of the *language* conceived as paradigm of paradigms, namely, actually, about establishing what the *languages* "are made" like. This is valid, at least, to the structuralism strictly functionalist (Coșeriu 2000: 194)
Functional stratum	In any syntagm, certain units from a level or a functional "stratum" are combined in superior level unit; and amongst these unit are established, on the level of the combination, certain syntagmatic functions, when this isn't always obvious (Coșeriu 2000: 148)
Functional unit / concretization variant	Due to the fact that each plan of the language-use involves other plan, we distinguish, therefore, between the functional unit (unit of "language") and the concretization variant. This is the sense which we must interpret in, the "existence" of the fact of language: it is about their functional existence. The contextual differences ascertained on a sole plan of the two ones (until here only on the expression's plan) they mustn't be ignored, of course, but one can notice that, from functional point of view, it is about "the same thing" (Coșeriu 2000: 164)

A functional unit isn't simply the sum of its variants, neither is what can be abstracted as being common out of these ones, but it is something belonging to another plan: the plan of the "language" as such, on this plan existing as unique, homogenous, and unitary fact. So that a unit is "concretized" or it is "manifested" in it variants, and the variants present or express the unit (…), being differentiated amongst them by the fact that, in concretization, they receive contextual and situational determinations: they constitute the unit which they represent and something more, or they are the same unit but modified depending on contexts (Coșeriu 2000: 167)

When the functional units are identified to the ensemble of their distinctive traits, not only that the traits characterizing the variants are excluded, though mandatory, of a certain individual unit (…), but neither are they considered as constitutive for certain constant but non-oppositive, traits, which the unit can present in their |

	concretization, at least in certain contexts (Coșeriu 2000: 194)
Functional-integral description (linguistic)	A "functional-integral" description – in the scientific linguistics itself or in glotodidactics – it should, anyway, to attempt the reconciliation between the exigency of the homogeneousness of the structural description object with the exigency of corresponding to a real idiomatic competence. On this purpose, we should choose, without any doubt, as ‚main object of the description, a certain functional *language*, but, on the other hand, each time when it will be opportune, we will have to parallelly describe, and as a possible "deviation" from the chosen functional *language*, what its speakers know (at least passively) about other functional languages. Especially in glotodidactics, it would be recommendable and convenient to choose as basis of the description the functional *language* having the biggest spread in the three senses of the linguistic variety and which would represent the maximum number of coincidences with other functional *languages*, namely, in the "normal" cases, a form of the respective common *language*, on average level (by and large known, both by the speakers of the superior level and – in a certain measure – by the speakers of the inferior levels) and in a "neutral" *language* style. Regarding the "deviations" which must be recorded, these ones could belong to different types, depending on the linguistic communities (Coșeriu 2000: 274)

G

General grammar	We must distinguish between the grammar without adjectives and the general grammar, as branch of the theoretical linguistics or of the theory of the *language-use*, which studies the fundamentals of the grammatical concepts or which tries to find in different linguistic systems some aspects common to all of them, or some analogue manifestations, which would demonstrated that in each historically existing *language* it is reflected a grammar of the "*language* by and large", common to the entire mankind (…). According to the first meaning, the general grammar should rather be called as grammatical theory and it is a fully legitimate linguistic science; in the second meaning, it is rather a philosophical speculation (or pretending to the philosophical), which the most part of the linguists, especially the historicists and the anti-logicians, they consider it as lacking a real foundation (Coșeriu 1999: 96)
General grammatic	The general grammatic, correctly understood, it refers, actually, to the speaking by and large, for the verb, the substantive, the adjective etc. they cannot be defined in report with a certain *language*. Any definition refers to a universal category, to a possibility of the *language-use*, independently from a *language* of

	another. By relating to a certain *language*, we will only can say whether a category exists or not in that *language*, and if it exists, we will be able to specify its functions and we will be able to describe the material scheme of its expression: contrary to what some North-American structuralists (Bloomfieldians) argue, it is absurd to aim to define, for instance, "the adjective in the English *language*", given the fact that on the moment it is defined as "adjective", its definition is valid for any other *language* which the adjective can appear in. It is sure that we must describe – and not to define – "the adjective in the English *language*", if this category exists in the respective *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 246)
General linguistics	Whose object should be constituted by the so-called Sprachvermogen, the faculty of the *language-use* (Coșeriu 2000: 12)

Science studying the *language-use* in its essence and in its general aspects, without referring to a certain *language*, it is called as general linguistics, often more precisely identified to what one could call as philosophy of the *language-use*. We have here an identification which is better to avoid, because these two disciplines adopt different point of view (Coșeriu 1999: 17)

The general linguistics, instead, it orients in a contrary direction, namely it starts from the concrete linguistic phenomena and, after systematizing them, it attempt to establish their general characteristics, especially on the basis of the research already accomplished by the individual linguistics, namely on the linguistics studying, on each case, a determined *language* or a group of *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 17-18)

Many linguists prefer to call the general linguistics as theoretical linguistics, or as theory of the *language-use*, in order to highlight the preponderantly theoretical and methodological character of this science, and they oppose it to the empirical linguistics, namely to the individual study of a *language*; other reserve the name of "general linguistics" to an ampler science, which comprises the "theoretical linguistics" and, in the same time, the entire ensemble of linguistic "general" sciences, which study the diverse aspects of the *language-use* (phonetics, semantics, general grammar, stylistics etc.) without referring to a certain *language* (Coșeriu 1999: 18)

By reserving the name of general linguistics (or simply: linguistics) to the discipline starting from the concrete linguistic facts in order to come up to their general characteristics, and which, consequently, it sums up all the individual investigations referring to these "facts", we can distinguish within it its diverse branches, namely several individual linguistic sciences or disciplines, corresponding to the diverse aspects of the *language-* |

	use, which we've already delimited (Coșeriu 1999: 93)
	The general linguistics belong to the domain of the general sciences. Understood in its real meaning, it represents a science proceeding inductively. It activity domain is constituted of the *languages* identified and delimited "pre-scientifically" from one another; its main task is that of identifying the analogies and the common point amongst the diverse *languages*, than to operate inductive generalizations. As self-standing discipline, the general linguistics is situated on the level of the empirical generalities (Coșeriu 2011: 39)
	The syntagm: general linguistics (…) it isn't a free joining, but it is a lexicalized syntagm (Coșeriu 2011: 39, nota 1)
General principles of the thinking	Integrally valid for the sphere of the *language-use*, as there are, for instance, the principle of the identity and that one of the non-contradiction. These principles are intuitively given in any act of speaking. This doesn't that each speaker could formulate these principles, or even to explain them, but it only means that these principles are already present in each speaker. The premise that we can make a reference to something that has already been named, with the help of the pronouns, it is, for instance, above assuming the identity of what has been once named, beyond the fact of its naming (Coșeriu 2013: 64)
Generality (empirical)	The generality represents the ensemble of the constant particularities which, by already having the concept, we effectively ascertain them in an objects class; the characteristic traits which, rigorously speaking, can to not be indispensable in order the objects to be what they are: simply, these traits are present in them (Coșeriu 2000: 38)
Generations' theory	Another theory of Meillet, which could be called as the theory of the generations, it argues the idea that the linguistic change is due specifically to the linguistic differentiation established between generations, or to the fact that the children never exactly reproduce their parents' language. This theory will be perfectly acceptable if understand through it that only the son doesn't exactly reproduce his parent's language, what, in essence, it means that nobody reproduces identically, in his linguistic acts, the model according to which he creates his expression. But it is a violent and unnecessary abstraction that one of introducing the notion of "generation", because the generation is something purely conventional and it has not concrete existence (the ages of the persons in a community represent a "continuum"). In addition to that, in order to argue such a theory, Meillet leans against a premise that cannot be admitted: he affirms, so, that "due to unknown reasons", maybe physiological, certain phenomena would take place simultaneously in the speaking of an entire generation. (…) Formulated thus, the theory cannot be accepted because, actually, it can be reduced to the same biologism and

	physiology-ism which we've already rejected as baseless. It is obvious that, normally, we remark the existence of an innovation only when it has reached a certain spreading, as it is so obvious that the innovations are accepted especially by youngsters and by children, both due to the innovative tendencies of the young people and due to the fact that the linguistic habits to children aren't consolidated yet by a constant use of the corresponding forms. But the innovations take place and they can take place simultaneously in a whole "generation". The studies undertaken in this sense, especially in Denmark, they demonstrated that, from this point of view, the children, as speakers, they do not differ from adults. Amongst children are established, even in the purely infantile activities, as there are the games, hierarchies analogue to those established amongst adults; namely certain children, due to their personal qualities or to some social reasons, they reach to have a greater prestige, and the other children imitate them from linguistic point of view, accepting their way of speaking. If on a given moment, to children it is recorded a new pronunciation, it isn't appropriate by any means to affirm that it will be adopted simultaneously by all children; one must rather suppose that, as in any other case, the new pronunciation has been adopted at the beginning by a sole individual, by a child, who was imitated by other children in the respective environment (Coșeriu 1999: 83-85)
Generative-transformational grammar	Totally different is the case of the generative-transformational grammar of N. Chomsky, which is developed, in a sense, by starting from the bloomfieldian linguistics, not by developing it, but in opposition to it. Consequently, we cannot speak about the transformational grammar as about a "form" of the structuralism, or as "the most recent" form of this orientation. Likewise, it is inappropriate to present it as it will simply be about structuralism in its "present" and more elaborated form, as it has been done recently in Germany. It is sure the fact that between the transformational grammar and structuralism there are historical relations, both direct and indirect, and of "negative sense". On one hand, the "transformations" as such have been identified in facts by Z. Harris, Chomsky's professor (who also developed for the first time a form of "transformational grammar"). On the other hand, the initial "factic" motivation of the need for a transformational grammar mostly consisted of bloomfieldian linguistics' disorientation when facing the phenomena of "ambiguity" and of "cognitive synonymity", namely of equivalence in designation, phenomena which, truly, they cannot either be understood or entirely justified within the frame of a situational conception of the signified (of if one wants to make abstraction of signified). In addition to that, the transformational grammar met, to say so, "an empty research space", due to the insufficiencies and to the deficiencies from the studies dedicated by the classic structuralism to the "superior" syntax (especially to

the sentence's syntax), succeeding in inserting itself within this space with notable contributions (as it is the excellent interpretation of the interrogative and negative English sentences, given by Chomsky himself in *Syntactic Structures*). The transformational grammar has created the impression that it would completed and developed the structuralism on as domain which the structuralism didn't pay enough attention to (impression partially explaining the initial success of the transformational grammar). We must observe though, that to Harris, the transformational grammar didn't represent a new type of grammar, but it was rather a compartment of the "distributional" grammar, and the "transformations" didn't have the same meaning like at Chomsky. It is only about some regularities in the distributional reports between different sentences; for instance, the fact that – in the case of two sentences constituted of the same elements. Chomsky, instead, he very quickly got far from this conception of the "transformation" as simple distribution of the forms, by interpreting it as relation between the "surface structure" and the "deep structure". This fact determined Chomsky to evaluate the intuitive knowledge of the speakers and to reject the basis itself of the bloomfieldian linguistics – the "anti-mentalism". In what regards the descriptive problem of the "ambiguity" and of the " cognitive synonymy", it wasn't solved in the sense which the functional structuralism would have proceeded, namely by distinguishing between designation and the *language* signified and adopting the principle of the "unitary signified", but, on the opposite, by identifying the signified to the extralinguistic designation and by amplifying the notion of "ambiguity". This last one, it reached to coincide to the notion of variety in designation, so that have been adopted two (or more) profound structures for all the case of this amplified "ambiguity" and, inversely, a unique profound structure for each case of "cognitive synonymy". In other words, Chomsky presented these phenomena in a totally anti-structural sense. As about the "empty space" in the syntactic research, the transformational grammar doesn't "fill it up" in a structural sense, because of not aiming to establish the functional idiomatic units (characteristic to a certain *language*). It is true that Chomsky quoted Sapir in a praiseworthy way, not for his structural conception, but for his (non-behavioristic) "mentalism" and for the value which Sapir attributed to the intuitive knowledge of the speakers. The transformational grammar mentions Sapir, in this sense (as it could do in the case of any other "mentalist"), but it doesn't claim that it originates from Sapir; the transformational grammar comes from Bloomfieldians, as denial of their theories. Even more, if we let aside these contingent relations as also some superficial aspects, as there it would be the terminology (partially inherited from the bloomfieldian linguistics), the transformational grammar, as method and as conception, it presents itself as being the contrary to the structuralism. The transformational grammar

129

opposes not only to the "asemantic" structuralism, but it opposes to the entire structural linguistics, as a new form of the descriptive linguistics, as having another object and other finalities. In a way, it contravenes to the European structuralism even more radically than to the Bloomfieldian linguistics, for out of the last one it retained (at the beginning) the methodological exclusion of the signified and (until today) it has retained the identification – or the indistinction – between the *language* signified and the extralinguistic designation (Coșeriu 2000: 130-131)

In the transformational grammar, as well, it is operated the explicit distinction between "*language*" and "speaking" – or, using the terms from generativism: between "competence" and "performance" – but the *language* (the "grammar") it is interpreted as "mechanism" (as system of rules) in order to unite some extralinguistic contents (meanings) with some expressions ("phonic representations") (Coșeriu 2000: 132-133)

The transformational grammar, instead, it represents a synthetic method: it aims to demonstrate what one speaks through the mediation of the *language* like (Coșeriu 2000: 133)

The transformational grammar aims to "synthesize" the discourse units: to present the technique of producing them (Coșeriu 2000: 133)

To the transformational grammar the basic unit is the sentence: the grammatical unit in discourse (Coșeriu 2000: 133-134)

The transformational grammar, instead, it is equally called as "generative", for it aims "to generate" sentences which are possible into a *language*, namely to enumerate the necessary operations ("rules") for producing these sentences; it is called as "transformational" for amongst these rules are mentioned also the ones of "transforming" some primary structures ("of depth") in other secondary structures ("of surface"). Regarding the procedures, the structuralism is essentially "semasiological": it starts from forms in order to establish ("to discover") their functions; it asks, for instance, if a form does correspond, in a given *language*. To an "instrumental", namely, if it has as own and exclusive idiomatic function that of expressing the "instrument". The transformational grammar, a contrary, it is essentially "onomasiological": it asks how certain contents of thinking are expressed in a certain *language*. Actually, it is denied or it is questioned the possibility itself of elaborating some "discovery" techniques; and the *language* unities and functions, they are presented as being known or they are simply ignored because, in accord with its modes of elaboration, these ones aren't indispensable, and there are coherently presented only the rules

governing the use of the respective forms in construing the sentences. So, in the generative-transformational grammar they do not ask what an "auxiliary" is, neither which is its *language* function, but it is only indicated the use of what it is understood as "auxiliary"; they do not ask if the considered *language* knows the "instrumental" function as idiomatic function, but only what is the mode which this *language* expresses the "instrumental" in (regardless to the fact that those forms are used for other designations as well). Even the fundamental principle of the structuralism, that one of discovering the *languages* in their specificity, it is suspended in the transformational grammar, which, while approaching the *languages* from the point of view of their linguistic extralinguistic or pre-linguistic (expressible in certain languages or in any language) contents, it comes increasingly closer (with full coherence) to the universal or "general" grammar. (…) the transformational grammar tend to be (and in its last form, called as :generative semantics", it explicitly is) "universalist" (Coșeriu 2000: 134-135)

The transformational grammar aims to elaborate, in the form of a coherent system, the "generative" approaches which in the traditional grammar are presented in an isolated manner, sporadically, and incoherently. In the "scientific" linguistics, instead, partial precursors of this one (regarding its first and second aspects) are the linguists who made the distinction between the analytical grammar and the synthetical grammar (as Bally and Sechehaye), or who, under this name or under other names, they identified "real" transformations (for instance in what regards the subordination or the forming of the words), namely, again, Gabelentz and Bally, as also scientists as O. Jespersen, W. Porzig and J. Kurylowicz (Coșeriu 2000: 136)

The transformational grammar uses matrix of elements (thus it happens also in phonetics and in the case of the so-called rule of "subcategorization" which justify the lexical conditioning of certain propositional structures). In such case are applied, in reality, structural techniques (though not in order to establish idiomatic units, but only on the measure which this is necessary in, in order to produce "correct" sentences) or are adopted, mutually, the results of the same structural analysis which explicitly is rejected. All of these mean that, only on the measure which it operates with syntagmatic structures in, the transformational grammar is "structural" too; but in a sense which the whole grammar, including the traditional one, they would be structural in (Coșeriu 2000: 155)

The really deficient situation is that of the functional grammar, especially in what regards the superior levels of grammatical structuring, namely the words group, the sentence, and the "text"

131

(as idiomatical grammatical "stratum", and not as plan of the *language-use* by and large). In this domain it continues to be accepted to these days the opinion that the propositional functions are universal and rather having a "logical" nature than a grammatical nature, and that's why, practically, they wouldn't contribute to the *languages*' diversity. Or, simply, this isn't true (Coșeriu 2000: 156)

The transformational grammar starts from competence towards what is given, claiming that it presents (it construes or it "simulates") this competence as being an active knowledge, in a form of rules for "producing' the sentences (so that excludes the case of a unknown *language*) (Coșeriu 2000: 160)

The transformational grammar identifies the description to the presentation of the rules of producing or of "synthesizing" and it doesn't offer methods for identification and analysis (or of "unveiling") (Coșeriu 2000: 160)

In the transformational grammar, until these days, it hasn't been clarified the relation between the rules proposed by a linguist and the reality of the *language-use* (namely the grammatical system which the speakers themselves apply it in speaking): sometimes it is affirmed or it is supposed that the rules (or, at least, the rules types) are real, that they coincide to the linguistic competence of the speakers and it is claims that it "construes" this competence; some other times, it says that this doesn't matter and that important it is to find the simplest rules system in order to "simulate" this competence and to produce some sentences by using some forms (which are previously known). But it is clear that this thing it depends on the adopted "depth" structures, and it can lead to configuring some quite arbitrary rules (Coșeriu 2000: 160, nota 1)

The transformational grammar approaches the "constituting" and the "relations", but, as in the domain of the expression too, it ignores in the grammar as well, - deliberately – the central and determinant aspect of each *language*: the idiomatic functions (in the sense that it doesn't make of them an object of description, neither of research). Int his sense, it is significant the attitude adopted by transformationalists regarding the phonemes: the fact that in the transformational grammar the functional phonic units are ignored (and rightfully, because accordingly to its specific way of putting the problem, they do not need to be studied) it is interpreted as nonexistence of these units. In what regards the grammatical contents, they do not reach this point, but, given the fact that in the transformational grammar the proper meaning of the commutation hasn't even been correctly understood, they think that the linguistics doesn't have any "method to discovery" the

functional units (these ones being mostly reduced to functions of extralinguistic designation) (Coșeriu 2000: 230)

From totally different motives, in the classic form of the generative-transformational grammar too (the so-called standard theory), the syntax represents the basic section of the descriptive linguistics; even more, it represents the primary discipline of the entire linguistics. Actually, in this orientation, the linguistic knowledge (the speakers' "competence") it is identified to the capacity of forming sentences (or "all the correct sentences" into a *language*: the already said sentences and the untold yet sentences), and the grammatical system of a *language* it is conceived as "mechanism" in order to unite, in the process of forming the sentences, certain contents of extralinguistic thinking (meanings) with certain phonic representations, in other words, as system of syntactical structuring. Consequently, the syntax appears as being the central part of the *languages*' description, according to the following scheme: "phonetics", syntax, and "semantics". The properly-said "structures" of a linguistic system and the reports uniting them, they are established, in this "model", by the syntax. The "phonetics", instead – which is a part of the "morpho-phonemics", integrating the "morphology" as well -, and the "semantic" (this last one integrating the lexicology as well) they "interprets", respectively, the "surface" syntactic structure and the "depth" syntactic structure, namely they establish the phonic material which the first one is expressed in, and the extralinguistic "reference" of the second one (Coșeriu 2000: 87-88)

Generative-transformational theory	Chomsky and his colleagues aimed to analyze those abstract rules of a language allowing the production of correct sentences, form grammatical and semantical point of view, and excluding the incorrect sentences. Those rules must be on a very deep (or high) reduction level and the surface structure should be analyzed through several transformations. These rules do not make, probably, any sense, but they automatically derive out of the depth structure. For it is considered that they are especially of syntactical order, the language's syntax has become the main area of investigation. They leaved the lexical problem to the dictionary, which must contain, besides definitions, a list of restrictions regarding the collocations. A special accent has been placed on the rigor of the depth structures, for the final purpose has been that of operating with a minimal number of units and a maximal number of rules (Nida 2004: 56)
Generativism	The generativism aims to coherently present, and as ordered system of rules, the technique which the speakers applies in his speaking: his "competence" understood as "science" regarding the formulation of the "correct" sentences" in a given *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 158)
Genevan School	The school from Geneva has been constituted (and expressly declared as "school") by the direct disciples and successors of

	Saussure: Ch. Bally and A. Sechehaye, elaborating the hand notes taken while attending the lectures held by Saussure between the years 1907 and 1911; the published so the Course of General Linguistics. The main representatives of this school are: M. Frei, H. Burger, and R. Godel. The last one published also the manuscript sources of the Course, instilling thus new studies on Saussure. As representative of this school can be also considered S. Karcevskij, who, until his death (1955) taught at Geneva, but who, as we've seen, activated also within the Circle from Prague. Only after the "Prague" manifesto, this school came closer to structuralism, especially through the works of M. Frei, given the fact that Bally and Sechehaye dedicated themselves rather to other aspects of the Saussurian doctrine, especially, to interpreting and mutually revising the Saussurian dichotomies. The "school" is characterized by clearly separating the synchrony from diachrony and by almost totally neglecting the structural study on the expression's plan, by focusing upon the synchrony and the theory of the sign, but its negative attitude towards the systematical character of the linguistic change and towards the diachronic structuralism. Lately (but partially even before) it consecrates itself especially to rebuilding the authentic sense of Saussure's thinking, and to defend the Saussurian doctrine, even in the hardest to sustain aspects, constantly taking the risk of confounding the exegetic problems to the problems referring to the reality of the language-use (as in the case of A. Burger, for instance). The ideology specific to Genevans hasn't got spread, practically, outside Switzerland, except a few concepts and terms (as that or "moneme", owed to M. Frei) and of the exegetical studies on Saussure. A certain spread has had, of course, the "language's stylistics", but in this case is about a discipline founded and developed by Bally before the publication of the Course of General Linguistics (Coșeriu 2000: 114-115)
Genus humile	Regarding the macrostructure of his writings, Aristotle can be considered the creator of the scientific study as type of text. The style's prosaism, the renunciation to rhetoric adornment – traits which, to the aesthetes upset, it characterizes in our culture, up to these days, the scientific texts – they originate at Aristotle. IN the stylistic theory of the antique rhetoric, the scientific prose was framed in genus humile (Coșeriu 2011: 101)
Glossematics	In glossematics – the linguistic doctrine of Louis Hjelmslev (…) – the *languages*' description is understood firstly as a purely formal fact: some kind of "*language-use*'s algebra". Or, this "technical" aspect has been discussed and criticized from totally different positions, being objected that, amongst others, it has an "extremely abstract" character, and it focuses upon the empirical difficulties faced by the description when postulating to be ignored the "substance" of the approached facts. In other words, it has been approached as it would be about a facultative technique applied to the same facts constituting the object of other currents

from linguistics (for instance, the phonemes). In glossematics, though, it is not about something facultative, but it is about the unavoidable consequence of a mode of conceiving the description's object, and therefore it is not, in a proper sense, about the same facts (Coșeriu 2000: 89)

In glossematics the *languages* are reduced to some mathematical objects due to a theoretical exigency, on the virtue of a conception about *language-use* (Coșeriu 2000: 97)

In glossematics (where, as it has been said, it is about "cenemes") it is accepted also, in both cases, the signified (the "content"), though divided, as the expression too, in "form" and "substance". The identification will be done, consequently, through the same procedure of the commutation. But the *language* units can't be described in terms of substance, for in glossematics the substance (phonic, graphic etc.) it doesn't belong to the "language's" plan as such (as pure form), but it belong to the "linguistic use". That's why, in order to describe, it is employed the "distribution" (Coșeriu 2000: 99)

In glossematics, for instance, almost all the terminology is new, because its founder, Hjelmslev considered as necessary to highlight the novelty of the concepts and of his approach, inclusively by using some new terms, differing – in their form and in their value, or in both these aspects – both from the terms of the traditional linguistics and from the terms of other orientations from the modern linguistics, and also differing from the terms of the current *language-use*'s metalinguistic terms (Coșeriu 2000: 74)

The glossematics, as we have already mentioned, it is characterized firstly by adopting and developing a coherent mode of the thesis of F. the Saussure, according to which the *language*, as signs system: "it is a form and it isn't a substance", being thus, in this sense, rigorously Saussurian. Just because of these reasons, the glossematics pushes the boundary between *language* and speaking; whilst to the "Orthodox" Saussurian, the language is everything that is "social" (for instance, not only the phonemes, but also "the mandatory variants of materialization" - …), to the glossematics the *language* is only a pure form ("scheme"). According to this conception, everything that represents "substance" (the phonic *language*, the written *language* etc.) it is a "use", namely, it is a materialization of the *language*, or "parole" (by not being "norm" to each use [for instance, the plan of the phonemes: what we call today as "system" of the *language* – but it is an "abstraction", without real existence). In addition to that, by making the distinction, with Saussure, between signifier and signified ("expression" and " content"), Hjelmslev distinguished,

135

as we have seen, two forms and two substances – one for each of the two plans – by affirming, in the same time, the structural analogy between these plans, with a perfect parallelism between the types of units, in what regards their position within system (though, of course, not between each expression's unit and a certain unit of the content). Thus, to the "cenemes" correspond, on the plan of the content, the "pleremes"; to the expression's "prosodemes" correspond, on the plan of the content, the "morphemes"; to the central and marginal cenemes ("vowels" and "consonants") correspond the "radical" and "derivative" pleremes.

A global doctrine, the glossematics hasn't spread outside Denmark: only the Norwegian Romance *languages* specialist, L. Flydal, has adhered to this theory. But, several scientists, have bene influenced, more or less, by this doctrine; thus, H. Vogt from Norway, and A. J. Greimas, one of the founders of the structural semantics (lexicology) from France. It has had the same influence upon B. Malmberg, the first amongst the Swedish structuralists, and upon the great Polish linguist J. Kurylowicz, though in what regards the conception about *language-use* both of them are situated between glossematics and the Prague structuralism). In addition to that, the glossematics has exercised, in some aspects, a notable influence upon the European structuralism, and partially upon the North American structuralism too; some concepts and/or terms, which today are general or almost general amongst structuralists, they come from Hjelmslev. Thus, the concept of "paradigmatic" (instead of "associative"), "commutation", "expression's plan", and the "content's plan" etc. (Coșeriu 2000: 116-117)

The glossematics is called like that for it aims to reach the minimal differential elements of the expression and of the content, the so-called glossemes (Coșeriu 2000: 133)

In glossematics (…) it is granted a special interest in identifying and describing the functions, whilst the physical-material aspect of the grammatical structure is only superficially approached, being neglected the relations (Coșeriu 2000: 229-230)

Glossemes	Minimal differential elements of expression and of content, the so-called glossemes (Coșeriu 2000: 133)
Grammar	Each language can be studies by an individual linguistic (the Spanish linguistics, the French linguistics, the Romanian linguistics etc.) but, usually, the study of the linguistic traditions considered as systems, it is called as grammar (Coșeriu 1999: 96)

The grammar, in all it meanings, it is the science of all the aspects of a *language*, namely it includes the phonetics, the semantics, and the other compartments of each individual *language*. By and large, when applied to a sole *language* and in synchrony, the term is |

especially understood as designating both the study of the forms which the linguistic signs (the words) achieve in sentence (or in phrase), a s also of the functions and of the reciprocal relations on the same plan, or as morphology and syntax. In the same way, as description of a *language*, the grammas can be understood not only as study of the aspect of pure communication (the enunciative *language-use*), but also of the affective aspect, that one of expressing sentiments and will impulses (the emotive *language-use*); but, usually, the term it refers to the purely enunciative "convention" (Coșeriu 1999: 97)

Regardless the objectively motivated common particularities, the historical grammar proposed by structuralism, it is very different from that proposed by the linguistic idealism, and the grammar postulated by transformationalists it differs from that of the "classic" structuralism (Coșeriu 2000: 83)

The grammar – this time without phonology, especially as theory and description of the grammatical categories – it is the primary and almost exclusive in "Guillaume-ism", though having another theoretical motivation: this is for the essential in *language-use* it is constituted, in the vision of the representatives of this current, by the modalities (of content) which the linguistic thinking is concretized in, in its crossing from virtual and generic to actual and concrete, namely, just the grammatical categories (modes and tenses of the verb, genre, case etc.) (Coșeriu 2000: 74)

Besides, the distinction amongst the three levels if the *language-use* – the level of the speaking by and large; the level of the *language*; and the level of the discourse or of the text – it must be done also in the case of the particular disciplines (amongst them, the grammar), for the role of these disciplines it differs depending on the level which they refer to. Thus, the grammar related to our three levels, it is: general grammar (not "universal grammar" of all the *languages*, an impossible and absurd thing, but grammatical theory: a form of the grammar having the task of defining verbal categories – "the parts of sentence" -, the grammatical categories, functions and procedures), the descriptive grammar (of a certain *language*), and the grammatical analysis (of a certain text) (Coșeriu 2000: 245)

Distinguishing three levels of the *language-use* it can be applied to all the linguistics' domains, for this distinction is everywhere important and indispensable; and, each linguistic discipline uses this distinction, if not explicitly, then at least mutually. This is the case of the grammar as well:
- Speaking (respectively *"language-use"*) by and large = theory of the grammar, general grammar
- *Language* as such, historical tradition of the speaking =

	descriptive grammar - text = grammatical analysis (Coșeriu 2013: 27) 1. Ensemble of rule regarding the word's modification and combining them in sentences; 2. Branch of the linguistics occupying itself with the systematic study of all the constitutive elements of a *language*; the study of the grammatical structure of a *language* (the morphology and the syntax). 3. Ensemble of rules of an art, of a technique, or of a science; a finite multitude of rules defining a *language-use* (www.Dex.ro)
Grammatical analysis	In what concerns the text, the grammar's object is that of grammatical analysis, namely of identifying the grammatical functions expressed in a certain text. Rightly, the grammatical function are mostly identifiable only on the text's level; or they present aspects and nuances justifiable only in a certain text; this is due, partially, to the fact that there can take place a total coincidence between the material schemes belonging to different categories (for instance of the substantive or of the adjective (…) and, partially, due to the fact that certain grammatical determinations can function implicitly, grace to their "contexts" (Coșeriu 2000: 246)
Graphematic	Referring to grapheme (www.Dex.ro)
Graphematics (or graphemics)	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000: 90)
Graphical units	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000: 90)

H	

Hearing as linguistic sense	From the point of view of the *language-use*'s theory, even the theses of Hamann and Herder, they still contained something enough interesting and positive, and which is right to be highlighted: the identification of the hearing as "linguistic" sense, namely able to capture the succession and so, the intrinsic temporality ("linearity") of the speaking and of the material sonority characteristic to the *language-use* and adequate to the speaking's nature, just because it is developed in time and intermittently (while the sight corresponds rather to the contiguity and, so, to the space and to the spatial reports amongst "things") (Coșeriu 2009: 338)
Historical context	Through historical context I understand the totality of the "historical" circumstances known to the speakers (Coșeriu 2013: 145)
Historical context: present / past	An expression like *pope* it is individualized only through the mediation of the actual universal context, and not through the mediation of the past context; this is for, on one hand, during

	history there existed many popes and, on the other hand, there wasn't always a sole pope in a sole place (Coșeriu 2013: 145)
Historical individual context	It can be determined by a very small community, as a family or a village (Coșeriu 2013: 145)
Historical *language*	One can say that a historical *language* isn't ever a sole linguistic system, but it is a diasystem, and more or less complex ensemble of "dialects", of "levels", and of "*language* styles" (…) Let's notice that, normally, each of these systems are (more or less) homogenous from a sole point of view; in each dialectic can be ascertained diastratic and diaphasic differences (and, consequently, levels and style of *language*); on each level, the diatopic and the diaphasic differences (dialects and styles); in each style, diatopic and diaphasic differences (dialects and levels) In addition to that, the limits between *language* levels and styles can be different in different dialects; and the limits between styles can differ on different levels. A historical *language* can't, consequently, to be structurally and functionally described as a linguistic system, as a sole unitary and homogenous structure, because, simply, it isn't so. A contrary, it frequently comprises quite different linguistic systems, sometimes no less different than historical languages recognized as such (let's think, for instance, at the Italian meridional and septentrional dialects). Besides this, a unique structural description of the entire historical *language,* even if wouldn't be impossible from rational and empirical point of view, wouldn't have any practical interest, because a historical *language* isn't being spoken: it is not concretized in speaking, as such and immediately, but only through the mediation of one of its forms determined in a diatopic, diastratic, and diaphasic manner. Nobody can (simultaneously) speak the whole Italian of the whole English, the English "without adjectives" or the Italian "without adjectives" (for instance, an Italian to speak the Tuscan, the Roman, the Milanese etc. the popular and the cult *language* etc. the familial and the solemn *language* etc. or vice versa, a Tuscan Italian and in the same time the Sicilian, popular, cult, familial and in the same time solemn etc.) On each case it is being spoken a certain form of Italian: and not the ITALIAN *language*, but an ITALIAN *language* (as there would be the common, the Roman, the middle level, and the familial Italian *language*) (Coșeriu 2000: 267-268)

Through "historical *language*" we understand what usually happens, in our time, through a certain *language,* namely a certain speaking technique, already historically identified as such, as such recognized by its speakers and by the speakers of other *languages* and that, normally, it is called with a proper name, respectively with and adiectivul proprium das Deutche, the "German" *language*, die deutche Sprahe etc. (Coșeriu 2013: 110-111) |

	The different types of functional *languages* which a "historical *language* " is composed of (Coșeriu 2013: 116)
	From functional point of view, the historical *languages* aren't even perfectly homogenous; in the frame of a historical *language* there are – as we've already said, and here we only indicate again this aspect – differentiations: regional ("diatopic"), social (diastratic"), and differences conditioned by the situation which the speaking act unfolds in ("diaphasic"). So, a historical language must be conceived as a complicate network of idioms (respectively, regional variants of the literary *language*, "secondary dialects"), strata of the *language* ("sociolects" in a narrow meanings) and "styles of the *language*" (Coșeriu 2013: 116)
Historical linguistics; *languages*' linguistics	The linguists' attention has been focused until now especially on the historical level of the linguistic technique, namely upon *languages*: the linguistics – the "modern" one no less than the "traditional" one – it has been substantially a linguistics of the texts (Coșeriu 2000: 239)
Historical linguistic technique	The study of the universal technique it is necessary in order to exactly determine the functioning of the languages, for in speaking the universal technique and the historical technique are superimposed, completing one another, frequently and even "mandatorily", depending on languages (Coșeriu 2000: 241)
Historical plan of the *language-use*	The historical plan is, as we've seen, the plan of the "signified", of the "*language* functions". But, in order to identify the own domain of such functions – "the functional *language* (the *language* functioning in "discourses" – it is necessary to go a long way, and to distinguish between: 1) the knowledge of the *language* and the knowledge of the "things"; 2) *language-use* and meta-*language-use*; 3) synchrony and diachrony; 4) free technique and "repeated discourse"; 5) the "architecture" and the "structure" of the *language* (or the historical *language* and the functional *language*) (Coșeriu 2000: 251)
Historical universal context	I can be represented by ampler historical formations, as there would be the nations, the cultural communities, and the entire mankind (Coșeriu 2013: 145)
Homonymy	If different things are called with the same name, than this one cannot be φύσει. (Coșeriu 2011: 69)

I	

Icastic function of the sign	Directly imitating a designed thing through the signifier of each sign individually, respectively through significations of a chain of signs (Coșeriu 2013: 123)
Ideal grammar	A complete grammar of a *language* should, consequently, to

	comprise three sections: a "constitutional" section (or the "morphology" in a broad sense, including the sentence's morphology and the phrase's "morphology"), a "functional" section (study of the grammatical signified of the *language*), and a "relational" function. Just the "constitutional" and the relational" sections should be approached in dependency to the "functional" section, namely on the basis and from the point of view of the semantic functions which constitute the finality of the *language-use* and the reasons of existence of the *languages*; currently, no type of grammar corresponds to this "ideal grammar", because, actually, no grammar takes in consideration these three sections (Coșeriu 2000: 228)
Idealistic stylistics	The stylistic of idealistic type highlights the internal relations from certain texts, namely it takes in consideration any expressive fact of a text relatedly to the rest of the facts belonging to the same text and with the entire text (Coșeriu 2000: 62)
Ideology	The sign's expression has, though, a form too. Through: the "sign's form", the "expression's form", we must understand, firstly, in strictly glossematics meaning, the systematic position falling to each bearer of sign element, in the integrator structure of the oppositions on the expression's plan of a *language*. In addition to that, through the term "form of the sign" (referring to the expression's plan) we want to understand other aspects too, as there would be, for instance, the dimension, the extension of each sign take individually or of the chains of signs, as also those qualitative-numerical relations amongst the signs from within text, which we have already mentioned under another aspect and which were gathered together in the antique history under the name of numerus (Coșeriu 2013: 131-132)
Idiomatic / historical knowledge (of a *language*)	The historical knowledge, certified through possessing a certain *language*, I call it idiomatic knowledge (or of a *language*) (Coșeriu 2013: 72)
Imitating through the mediation of the (phonic) substance of the (linguistic) sign	Within this category we must distinguish, again, three subcategories: a) The direct imitation through the sonorous image (onomatope). The *language*, at least the original one, the spoken *language*, it is, considered in its expression, a structured sound; that's why, it goes without saying that that a direct imitation of the objects and of the situations through the mediations of the linguistic signs it can take place only on acoustic plan, in the sphere of the tones and of the noises. A contrary, the written *language*, regarded from the perspective of its expression, it is a form, it is a "drawing"; that's why, it can imitate, eventually, forms and images. This imitation form it stays at the very basis of the so-called ideographic systems; we encounter it, though, also in the domain of the systems having a writing with phonematic basis (Coșeriu 2013: 124)

	b) Direct imitation through articulation. Expressing ourselves by using the terms of the modern phonetics, here it is not about the auditive impression or about the acoustic form, but it is about articulation, about the movements necessary for producing certain sounds, respectively, certain sounds combinations. That's why, the articulation must correspond, in a way, to the designated things. Of course, this fact mustn't be understood in a genetical way; through this observation it is equally less suggested the fact that' on the basis of the "articulatory motivation", the words would receive other significations than those which they have in the respective *languages*. It is though, possible, without any doubt, that the linguistic signs to be used in a certain text in such a manner than to appear a report between what was said and the articulatory movements necessary for saying what it is to be said (Coșeriu 2013: 127)
	c) Synesthesia. A third type of imitation – also through the sign's substance – it has been studied by the up to now linguistics, also only tangentially. I am referring here to the "synaesthetic", which is based on the analogy amongst the diverse sensorial impressions. The synaesthetic relations between the auditive and the visual sphere are so generally spread, than they have entered the metaphoric of the daily *language*. They use, very often to speak in the case of an "i" about a "luminous" vowel or, a contrary, in the case of "u" about an "obscure" vowel (Coșeriu 2013: 128-129)
Imitation *language*	The tradition of using the *tongues* and the linguistic strata, on the purpose of evoking the "local color" or the "social color", it often leads to the apparition of a special style of the *language*, which could be called as "imitation language" (Coșeriu 2013: 118) The approximate imitation of the dialects it can lead even to the apparition of some special literary forms (Coșeriu 2013: 119)
Imitation *language-use*	Or "hybrid" dialects (Coșeriu 2000: 272)
Imperative function of the *language*	The *language*'s imperative function implies an attempt of the source of changing the receptors behavior. Such a discourse generates a certain tension, and it proposes to convince you, and it can be even menacing (Nida 2004: 64) The imperative function presupposes the attempt of influencing the others' behavior, and it can be accomplished through orders and urges. Although, this function if often more efficient when using the illustrative examples, the jokes on the subject, and the pertinent questions. Using this function it implies a certain dose of authority and power, and its efficiency is determined by the interest which the receptors manifest in their own evolution, which requires, again, a verbal negotiation (Nida 2004: 64)
Individual linguistics	Referring to the "families" of *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 47)

Informal *language-use*	Used amongst known people (Nida 2004: 37)
Informative function of the *language*	In the case of the informative function of the *language*, the source intents to modify the receptors' cognitive state. Consequently, the accent falls on the communication's content and, usually, it is employed in this sense a "casual" style, though the *language* level will be different when it comes about a handbook on how to put and engine together, in comparison to a astrophysics treaty (Nida 2004: 64)

The most obvious function of the *language* is the informative function, namely using the speaking in order to influence the cognitive state of the others. But this function still doesn't exceed twenty percent of all the case of employing the *language-use*. In order the informative function to be efficient one must start from knowledge already existing in the receptors' mind, and this implies some verbal negotiation. Otherwise, the speakers exceed the listener's level of understanding, or the people discuss without really communicating (Nida 2004: 161) |
| Initial bilingualism theory | It refers to individuals learning a language different than their own and who can reach even to abandon their own language, a fact that happens, though, after a certain time, during which the two languages are used together. Rightly so, like we admit the existence of a "phonological conscience" , likewise we can admit too, a syntactic conscience and a semantic conscience, by which, an individual, learning a language different from his own, he would apply to this one constructions which he is familiarized with, on the other hand, he would interpret at least a part of the new linguistic signs which he learns, relatedly to the signs which he is accustomed to. We refer by this, to bilingualism, in the current meaning of the term, namely to the individual effectively speaking two different languages, at least for a while and, by using one of them they let themselves be influenced by the other one. But, form theoretical perspective, one can consider as a limit case of bilingualism, even the occasional use of a sole sign belonging to another linguistic system. Well, in this linguistic act, or in successive linguistic acts which this one may have as model, there can take place, on one hand, the phenomenon of phonological adaptation (…) and of the other hand, the phenomenon called as popular etymology or the interpretation of the new, unknown signs, relatedly to known signs, belonging to the speaker's language, or a wrong interpretation of the "etymological" signified which the respective sign has it in the origin language, through the semantic relations with other signs belonging to the same language (Coșeriu 1999: 80) |
| Inter-comprehension (criterion for classifying the *languages*) | This criterion is valid in the case of the Romance *languages* (though not for all their dialects), because, by and large, a Spaniard doesn't understand a French, or an Italian, or a Romanian; but it no longer can be applied to the case of the Slav |

or Germanic *languages* (a Slovenian understands a Croatian, and a Danish understands a Swedish, each of them speaking their own *language*) and even less in the case of the Semitic *languages*, which present a remarkable homogeneousness. Sometimes, this criterion in invalid even within the same historical *language*: so, for instance, in the Italian system there are comprehension limits amongst some dialects, as there also are in the case of the German *language*'s system (Coșeriu 1999: 35)

Interjections, onomatopoeia	It has been ascertained, in addition to that, that the man's "shouting", in their most elaborated form, represented by interjections, they always have a conventional and traditional character, namely a character of symbols conventionally accepted by a community. Rightly so, some interjections which are identical from sonic point of view, they can manifest different things, namely to have distinct significations. The same thing can be said about onomatopoeia too, which in the human *language-use* imitate or try to imitate the natural noises or the animals' sounds. It has been proven the fact that the human nature doesn't ever reproduce these noises and sound in an exact manner: in the so-called "reproduction" there always is a symbolic and conventional aspect, or something belonging to a linguistic tradition, and this shows us that the natural sounds aren't so much reproduced but rather conventionally interpreted, and in a different manner depending on the diverse linguistic communities (Coșeriu 1999: 21)
Interlinguistic level	Amongst *languages* (Nida 2004: 34)
Internal differentiation of the φύσει/θέσει problems	Our second thesis is a historical-scientific one, and it refers to the internal differentiation of the φύσει/θέσει problems. The opposition which, for now, we also call it by using the φύσει/θέσει terms, ("through nature" – " through convention", namely "naturally conditioned, motivated" – "arbitrarily established, namely conventionally") it isn't, as it is often presupposed, simple and constant during history, even when referring to the terms used for name it; and even if there are used identical terms, it won't be ensured, thus, an identity of the problems in what regards their content and their meaning, neither an identity of the solutions to these problems (Coșeriu 2009: 54)
Internal factors	For instance, in deficiencies and in conditions of "imbalance" of the systems synchronically established: the *language* state must explain somehow, or to justify the change, and not vice versa (Coșeriu 2000: 74)
Internal loans	From dialect in the common *language*, from the common *language* in dialect, from the special *language-use*(s) and from slangs in the common *language*, and vice versa (Coșeriu 1999: 64)
Interpersonal function of the *language*	The interpersonal function of the *language* it implies the negotiation and/or the maintaining of the social status in order to establish the place in the social hierarchy. In all languages there are at least five different levels, including the ritualic level, the

	formal level, the informal level, the familial level, and the intimate level. The ones wanting to offer their own power symbolic valences, they speak to other with "superiority", and the people wanting to achieve power they imitate the *language-use* of the people in power. But in order to become solidary with their fellow humans, the people try to employ a *language-use* on the level of their interlocutors. The closed groups often accentuate the appurtenance feeling by developing their own jargon or slang (Nida 2004: 161)
Interpreting the world	To the "interpretation the world" it belongs another possibility too, which we referred to in another context, namely the possibility that the "things" to be able to function, at their turn, as "signs" inside a certain cultural space, which mustn't necessarily coincide to a certain *language*. I am referring through this, top the well-known phenomena, represented by the symbolical, traditional, and cultural value of a thing, in the frame of a cultural community, for instance the representation on a donkey as being an extremely stupid animal. The quite complex semiotic relations which can be developed out of this phenomenon, it can be once more very clearly explains with the help of the colors. Certain colors can have within a given community a certain symbolical value. The same thing is valid in the case of the objects too, to which such a color with symbolic meaning it represents a very relevant characteristic trait, as there is in the case of the "pure, untouched snow" or of the "raven as harbinger of misfortunes". It is so, about an indirect, "mediated" function of the sign" sign – (object) designated – (object) symbolized. We speak in this context, metaphorically, even about "*language-use*", for instance about the "colors' *language-use*" or about the "flowers' *language-use*", which the rose is granted in, a value differing from that of the cornflower (Coșeriu 2013: 136)
Inter-subjectivity (linguistic)	The *language-use* is rather a foundation and in the same time a primary manifestation of the social, of the "to-be-with-another" of the man, and the *language* isn't "mandatory" as external request, but as freely assumed obligation (this is, besides, the genuine and original meaning of the Latin: Obligatio). The *language-use*, consequently, it is also an expression of the inter-subjectivity and just in the double meaning of the solidarity with a historical tradition and of the "contemporary" solidarity with a speaking community, which is historical as well (Coșeriu 2009: 52)
Intimate *language-use*	Used in a very united group, or in a family (Nida 2004: 37)
Intonation	Each unit presents a "phrase accent", situated above the other accents of the phonic groups which integrate it, and , in addition to that, it is characterized by a melodical curve, which constitutes its intonation. The intonation is an important elocution element that distinguished the sentences types (words, forms, or special constructions); in writing, the intonation is expressed, but only imperfectly, through punctuation (Coșeriu 1999: 110)

Intra-linguistic level	On the level of the same *language* (Nida 2004: 34)
Isogloss	The term isogloss, introduced in the *language-use*'s science by the linguistic geography, it designates, in the first place, the ideal line which delimitates the common linguistic acts on a certain territory, but the same concept can be abstractly considered too, namely also in time, as an ideal line comprising the common linguistic acts from within a certain epoque, or of several époques and, as well, outside a geographically determined space, or as ideal line including the common aspects of the individual linguistic acts (Coșeriu 1999: 16) Each one of these isoglosses comprises not only the linguistic acts common to the ensemble taken in consideration, and that's why, the ampler if the system of isoglosses considered in space and in time, the smaller is the number of isoglosses constituting that system, and vice versa (Coșeriu 1999: 34) To certain communities correspond distinct systems of isoglosses and, according to the things we have already said, if the community's limits are widened, the number of isoglosses or of linguistic common acts (the "*language*") will be proportionally diminished. Depending on the community which the individual is in or which he places himself within, he obeys to some rules, to a convention which can be explicit, as that of any professional community (this is the situation of the technical *language-use*), or implicit, as in the case of any non-technical *language-use*, for instance, the familial *language-use*, excluding the slang's case, in which the convention of using some signs incomprehensible to those who do not belong to the respective community it presents itself as explicit (Coșeriu 1999: 57) To each community it necessarily corresponds a system of isoglosses ("*language*"), more of less different from the one ascertained in other communities" thus, the same person doesn't use the same *language-use* at home, in school, or in his/her professional environment (Coșeriu 2000: 74)
Isoglosses systems	The *languages* at their turn, they present internal differentiations from social point of view (the isoglosses systems corresponding to the social-cultural stratification, as also of the professional groups etc.) (Coșeriu 1999: 92)

K	

Know, to (linguistically)	To know it means conceiving something as identical to itself and as differing from others; and the function of the *language-use* it

	consists just in this. But, what in linguistic knowledge is conceived as identical to itself and differing from all others, it isn't except a content of the conscience. It is clear that there can be also "objects" of the physical experience, but, more precisely, only on the measure – like something experimented – that they already belong to the conscience's content. And, on the other hand, there is absolutely unnecessary to be objects of the physical experience. That's why, the existence of a signified it isn't by any means the proof for the existence of the "thing" than can correspond to that signifier (Coșeriu 2009: 47)
Knowing the things	Namely the fact that we do not speak only through *language-use*, but also with the help of some knowledge we have about things. This takes place, at its turn, in a double sense: α) On one hand, we speak with the help of the knowledge about things on the measure which we suppose a certain knowledge about things to our interlocutor, which we automatically relate us to (…) So, before anything, we have this knowledge about things and expectations regarding the "normalness" of the situation which we refer to, permanently, while speaking. β) On the other hand, we constantly relate ourselves to the knowledge of what is generally human, to the knowledge about ourselves, as people, and to the knowledge of "our world". We know a few things about our body, for instance that is has two hands and two legs. We know a few things about our world too, for our world constitutes our natural context; we know that in this world there is a sole sun and a sole moon, so that we speak about sun and moon without making any other specifications (Coșeriu 2013: 64-65)
Kymograph	The kymograph, in its simplest form, it is composed of a cylinder wrapped in smoky paper and of a vibrating membrane that, through the mediation of a stiletto, it is in contact with the cylinder. The membrane communicates with a receiver tube made of rubber, ending in a funnel, which the subject submitted to the experience he speaks to. The cylinder it is imprinted in a spiral movement, namely simultaneously circular and vertical, actioned by a motor. When emitting sounds in the funnel, these sounds are communicated to the membrane through the mediation of the rubber tube, and the membrane's vibrations are transmitted, through the mediation of the stiletto, to the cylinder and they are recorded on the smoky paper (Coșeriu 1999: 103-104)

L

Language	The specific forms of concretizing the *language-use*, namely in linguistic acts and in systems of isoglosses which, traditionally or conventionally, are called as *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 10)

We define the *language* as the "ensemble of the common linguistic acts (isoglosses) of a community of speaking individuals", namely the ensemble of the linguistic acts, sufficiently resemblant for being considered as identical, which are attested in the expression of a certain number of individuals (Coșeriu 1999: 16)

The *language* is, so, a system of isoglosses ascertained in a community of speakers; a system that can be ampler or more limited, according to the number of individuals composing that community and according to the space and time, bigger or smaller, taken in consideration. Such a system doesn't exist only concretely, as system of common linguistic acts effectively recorded, but it also exists virtually, in the conscience of the speakers belonging to a certain community, as memory of some previous linguistic acts and as possibility of producing, according to their model, new linguistic acts, more or less "identical", or intelligible within the same community (Coșeriu 1999: 16-17)

The *languages* disappear because of disappearing the community that speaks them, or because of being forsaken by that community in order to adopt another *language*; usually, though, the *languages* "evolve", namely they are historically modified, as all the social functions too (Coșeriu 1999: 26)

In reality, as we've seen, the general concept of "language" or, better said "the *language* by and large", it is an abstraction of ours: actually, there are ascertained only individual linguistic acts more or less resemblant and which, for methodological comfort, they can be considered as identical. A *language* isn't, therefore, but the ensemble of the practically identical linguistic acts, belonging to a community of individuals, a system of isoglosses conventionally established, which sums up what is common to the expressions of a community or even to a sole individual in different époques (Coșeriu 1999: 32)

Besides the fact that there exists an ensemble of common linguistic acts concretely expressed, the *language* is manifested as ensemble of common virtual linguistic acts: in the conscience of each of us, there is the *language* as model, and the same model exists, also, though not in an identical form, at the other persons belonging to our community (Coșeriu 1999: 32)

From purely linguistic point of view, the limit between "*languages*" it is a conventional one, like it also is the limits between dialects: it depends on the isoglosses taken in consideration, for there almost aren't isoglosses which to correspond exactly on a certain territory (Coșeriu 1999: 32)

The definition of the *language* as system of isoglosses it justifies the various uses of the term (Coșeriu 1999: 32)

Even more difficult is to establish the limits in time of a *language*. In a sense, one can say that a *language* doesn't occur and it doesn't disappear on a precise moment, or that it only develops or "evolves": the Latin isn't in this sense, a "dead language", for it continues to live in neo-Latin idioms, under the forms called as Galician-Portuguese, Spanish, Catalonian, Occitan, French, Italian, Rhaeto-Romanic, Romanian. Is died, instead, the common and the literary Latin, given the fact that there no longer exist any population to use it as such. That's why, one can say, conventionally, that Latin as such ends in the V-VI Centuries, namely when the unity of the common *language* broke definitively in the Romanic countries. Despite these, until the forming – if not definitive, at least an advanced one – of the common and literary *languages* (XII-XIV Centuries), we shouldn't speak about Romanic *languages* but about Romanic dialects. But, actually, this is a matter of convention and of terminological comfort (Coșeriu 1999: 43)

As one can see, the signification of the term *language* it is often variable in the common use, and it depends on the diverse criteria, more or less appliable, and, in last instance, it depends on conventions. Consequently, using this term being, actually, or mostly, conventional, it would be better to specify the meaning which we are employing this term with, on each time when we use it (Coșeriu 1999: 44-45)

In linguistics the term *language* presents several individual acceptations, as in the expression: special *languages*, artificial *languages*, creole *languages*, *lingua* franca (Coșeriu 1999: 45)

Of course, the *languages* constitute, up to a certain point, autonomous traditions, but, in the same time, they are in a complex network of relations with extralinguistic facts and traditions. The *languages* exist and develop not only on the virtue of the internal rationalities of their equilibrium as systems (structural relations), but especially in relation with other spiritual or social phenomena: the *language* is intimately tied to the social life, to civilization, to art, to thinking's development, to politics etc.; in a word, the *language* is tied to the whole man's life (Coșeriu 1999: 58)

A *language* is a habituation, a "habit" learnt by imitation; and, by and large, what is imitated it is the "better", it is "superior" or, at least, it is what is considered like that. The *language* is, in this sense, resemblant to the fashion, and the linguistic phenomena are

spread like the fashion's phenomena. The imitation can often obey some "stylistic" rationalities (one considers that a sign used by another community it is more expressive, by and large, or in certain circumstances), but on each case there are motives of cultural prestige, though what we call as "cultural prestige" is today a very elastic concept (Coșeriu 1999: 61)

The child learns the *language*, by and large, from his parents who transmit him the dominant norm within their community. But the parent too, they learn something from their children, especially due to stylistic reasons, namely they reckon that some infantile words are more affectionate, more tender, and more adequate in order to express certain relations characteristic to the family, which explains their acceptation and spread in all *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 62)

In a *language* one can effectively distinguish two aspects: the system on a given moment, and the system in its development, though, in a certain sense (if one takes in account the partially innovative character of any linguistic act), there exists only the diachronic aspect, namely the continual development, while the other aspect, the synchronic one, for a *language* considered in its totality, it constitutes rather a scientific abstraction in order to study the mode which the *language* functions in, as also the traits which, between two moments of the *language*'s development, they remain constant. On multiple purposes, including practical ones, it is necessary, really, to consider the *language* as something more or less stable, as a "static" system, characterized by a certain structure. To the synchronic aspect it corresponds the discipline called as "grammar" and which, in the ample meaning of the term, it is the description of a *language*; to the diachronic aspect it corresponds the "historical" grammar, and the *language*'s history. But the historical sciences too, they must refer to the synchronic aspect or, better said, to diverse "successive" states of the *language*; really a "living" *language* or really spoken, it is in a perpetual movement: on each moment take place in *language* an indefinite changes or, at least, of individual innovations, changes and innovations which are simply impossible to be recorded in their totality, because of ascertaining all the linguistic acts which took place or this are taking place it is something that exceeds the human possibility. That's why the historical grammar is, in reality, the comparing of some static systems or "*language* states" corresponding to some moments conventionally selected as typical. Thus, in the Spanish historical grammar, we consider as static successive systems: the Latin, the so-called "vulgar Latin", the pre-Romanic phase, and then the old Castilian, the common Castilian form the Golden Century etc. given the fact that it would be impossible to study the development of the *language* in its totality, by signaling all the innovative linguistic acts through

which gradual acceptation we have reached from the Latin system to the system of the common Spanish of these days (Coșeriu 1999: 74)

In other words, in *languages* there is a general regulative "tendency", but there is also manifested the contrary "tendency" (of the "tendency" to build up new, partial regularities: in history we assist to a continual doing, undoing, and restoring, of the systems (Coșeriu 1999: 87)

The *language* is a technique of speaking, or linguistic competence (Coșeriu 2000: 10)
Without any doubt, the *languages* are no longer considered as natural organisms; but, most of the times, the linguistic systems are "reified", being treated not as traditions of a man's free activity, but as "things", as natural objects (Coșeriu 2000: 80)

According to Hjelmslev – who, in this sense, he adopted and developed a thesis of F. de Saussure -, the *language* is a pure form, deprived of "matter" and independent inclusively from the "substance" (= matter linguistically organized) in which it manifests, namely independent both from the expression's substance (phonemes or sounds) and from the substance of the content (signified). Thus, on the expression's plan, the same linguistic form, the same "*language*" as formal system (let's say so: "what is Danish in the Danish *language*, what is Spanish in the Spanish *language* etc.) could manifest in several "substances" corresponding to the same matter (for instance, in different sounds systems) from material point of view: in phonic substance (the spoken *language*), in graphical substance (the written *language*(and, finally, in any other type of substance, given the fact that the signs could be built up of any material (Coșeriu 2000: 89)

It isn't necessary at all, that each *language* to express, in the form of idiomatic contents, functions as: the cause, the instrument, the condition etc. and the *languages* expressing those do not structure them necessarily in the same way (Coșeriu 2000: 157)

Consequently, it is opportune to no longer attribute to the *languages* universal "logical" functions (or functions of the speaking), but we need to establish on all levels the idiomatic effective functions and their corresponding paradigms. Out conviction is that all of these can and must be done from structural point of view, fi we want to know what the *languages* are structured like, and which are the structures of the linguistic thinking (Coșeriu 2000: 158)

If it is admitted that, instead, the grammatical: forms, functions, and relations, they characterize and distinguish the *languages*, it is

clear than that the "what", the "why", and the "how/what like" must be taken in consideration at least equally; the fact that they are studied from a certain angle, it is not relevant (Coșeriu 2000: 231)

There is no speaking not being expressed in a certain *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 235)

The structures, the oppositions, and the "idiomatic" functions (= of *language*) they must be ascertained and established in the technique of the functional *language*, more exactly, in its "system". Rightly, the functional *language* presents several organizations or structuring plans, a fact remarked, at least partially, also by the representatives of the generative-transformational grammar, who are speaking about "levels of grammaticality", despite the fact that until now, they haven't formulated precise criteria for distinguishing these levels and they haven't differentiated with exactness the levels themselves (Coșeriu 2000: 276)

The *language* is, actually, a technique, as "science on how to do", namely a grouping of "things", of modes of acting and, that's why, it is always directed towards future, it isn't only a "to be spoken", but is especially is a "to know how to speak". Besides, each *language* has by its nature, a future dimension as linguistic knowledge too, for it always is an open system containing, so, not only what, in accord with its rules, it has already been said, but, in a virtual mode, also everything that, by agreeing the same rules, namely agreeing the same functional positions and the same natural procedures characterizing that *language* – and, actually, constituting it -, it is a possible and not aberrant concretization (Coșeriu 2009: 335)

A "living" *language* from historical point of view it isn't a static system, but a dynamic one (Coșeriu 2009: 335)

The *language* is being done and undone in its functioning: it functions synchronically and, in the same time, through this functioning of itself, it is diachronically constituted for a future functioning (Coșeriu 2009: 336)

The *language-use* as speaking, it is concretized on each case according to a historically determined and conditioned technique, namely in accord with a *language* (Coșeriu 2009: 38)

A *language*, considered as isolated from the speaking which it corresponds to, it is an objective historical fact, a "historical object" and, consequently, such an object it can be easily "materialized" and conceived through the mediation of a

substantialist concept (Coșeriu 2009: 39)

Considering the *languages* as separated from speaking, it hides a series of risks which can lead us on wrong paths:
a) the risk of ignoring the relation of the *language-use* with the extralinguistic and to lose from sight the important fact that the *language-use*, despite its autonomy, it is even a form of recognizing the extralinguistic "reality"
b) the risk of easily rejecting, or of simply not taking in account the "ingenuine" conception upon the *language-use*, namely the conception characteristic to the speakers as such
c) the risk of confounding of equivalating the empirical generality of what is observed in *languages* to what is universal in the *language-use* (…)
d) the risk of supra-evaluating the diversity of the *languages*, namely of considering each *language* as something locked up in itself and therefore of not finding any way of access from a language to another, whilst, in reality, each *language* is, really, a historically specific system, but specific in the interior of what it is "universal" in *language-use*, so that each *language*, as Humboldt already saw, it is a key towards all the other *languages*.
e) the risk of not understanding correctly the technical character of the *language*.
f) the risk of understanding the *languages* – which are abstracted out of speaking and are objectified on the purpose of researching – as static products and of ceasing to consider the *language-use* as a production. (Coșeriu 2009: 39-40)

It isn't admissible either as a *language* (historical form of the *language-use*) to be defined as a system of activities "mainly serving for the purposes of the communication and of coordination of the activities amongst the community's members" (as does Carnap, referring to English). Because the "community" which is being referred here it isn't independent from *language* and it doesn't exist before *language*, but it seems to be delimited, as such, only by the *language* itself (it is actually about an idiomatic community), such a "definition" is, obviously, a vicious circle) (Coșeriu 2009: 45-46)

The general conception we have upon the *language*, as an universal human activity, individually exercised by observing the historically instituted norms, it leads us to distinguish three levels in the *language-use* sphere:
a) the universal level, the fact of speaking of the "*language-use* by and large", before any differentiation of the individual *languages* (at plural):
b) the historical level, of the historical individual *languages*, usually accompanied by identification attribute (German, French, Russian etc.), the *languages* level at plural;

153

	c) the texts' level, of the acts of speaking, respectively of the ensembles of acts of speaking, which are materialized by a certain speaker in a certain situation, something that can happen, of course, in oral or written form (Coșeriu 2013: 25)
Language change / innovation	The intimate reason of the change, of the innovation in *language* it is by any means the one we've indicated when speaking about the linguistic act, namely the lack of concordance between the linguistic act and its model. Namely, the innovation, the "change" in its initial and original moment, it always is an act of individual creation. This creation can be due to some articulatory habits, to some "errors" in selecting the model, to some stylistic motives (the exigencies of a great expressivity), to some cultural motives (for instance, the new object and concepts for which is needed the creation of new names), and even to some simply physical causes (as defects of pronunciation) etc. the linguistic creation can manifest on the material plan of the *language-use* (phonic change), on the plan of the significative content (semantic change) or on both plans concomitantly. And it can be creation in the strict meaning of the term, namely invention of a new sign, as also an act of choosing the model, as in the case which, by speaking within a community and within a determined linguistic convention, the speaker individual, due to any of the motives mentioned above, he uses as model for an "actual" sign an anterior sign belonging to another convention or to another cultural, social, or regional community, or it belongs even to a linguistic community in a broad sense, namely to a foreign *language*. There is, consequently, within the same linguistic system, a continuous passing of signs form a community to another, from a social stratum to another, form a region to another, and from a convention to another (or from the common *language* to dialects and vice versa, form the familiar *language-use* to the literary *language* and vice versa, from the emotive or affective *language-use* to the enunciative *language-use* and vice versa etc.), as there are also an interexchange amongst linguistic autonomous systems, namely amongst different *languages*. On each case, in the community which begins to be used in, and it is being spread in, the sign is presented as "innovation" and as "change" (Coșeriu 1999: 89-90)
Language level	Diverse types of linguistic usages which vary according to the environment and to the communication situation (social-cultural context, age category, professional environment etc.). The variations can be of lexical order (for instance: current *language* / technical *language-use*, or standardized *language-use* / slang etc.) or they can be variations both lexical and phonetic and syntactic (neat *language*, even literary, current, colloquial, familiar (but still correct), popular, argotic) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 73)
Language stage / stage of the *language* (synchronic /	In the description of a *language* stage, consequently, we will have to take in account these facts of implicit diachrony, and this is why some distinctions, "chronological" or not, they have a certain

diachronic)	functional value to the speakers: any subjective "diachronic" fact will have to be described in its own "synchrony" (namely, in its functioning) (Coșeriu 2000: 259)
Language styles	What is valid to the diatopic variety of the historical *language* it is valid in an even greater extent to the diastratic value (for the communication amongst levels is constant), and even more for the diaphasic variety, for each speakers uses different "styles of *language*": in this sense, any speaker is, in the frame of his historical *language*, plurilingual or "polyglot". It is true, despite all these, that the inter-dialectal competence is most often fragmentary and that, usually, the levels and the styles are only partially in divergence (namely, frequently, the same analogue structures and functions are valid for several levels and for several styles) (Coșeriu 2000: 274)
Language value	The neutral term can replace the characterized term, but the last one cannot substitute the first one. Well, we must understand this in the sense that it cannot substitute that term as language value, and not in the sense that it couldn't substitute it in designation, because the designation is a "fact of speaking" and it depends on the decision of the speaker. Likewise, the neutralization is, as such, a "fact of speaking", but the possibility of operating a neutralization is a fact of language: a possibility of the language that is concretized in speaking. That's why the neutralization, as concretization of such a possibility, it affects the language itself: in neutralizing a semantic opposition it is suspended a distinction, and the used content it corresponds, as fact of language, to this suspension. So it is explained the fact that using a neutral term it doesn't imply any special stylistic value (Coșeriu 2000: 207)
Language's economy	Similarly, we must accept the general norms, empirically established, of the *language*'s configuration and of the linguistic change, as also the so-called "economy" of the *language* outside the purely material domain. Of course, the freedom creating *languages* it is "rational" either from practical perspective, guiding itself according to some practical norms. That's why establishing these norms is justified: these norms belong to the general linguistics' heuristics, and by establishing them it is created a "expectation horizon" which serves us, later, as having the quality as reference frame, when describing and interpreting new facts. But we always have to bear in mind the fact too, that it is not established what has been expected, but something else or even the contrary of what has been expected (Coșeriu 2009: 66)
Language's egocentric function	The egocentric use of the *language* isn't always recognized as such, but it certainly manifests when the people use the *language-use* not in order to communicate information but in order to impress others with their erudition and with their rhetorical talent, by using sophisticated forms or by speaking or writing about impossible to understand things. The egocentric *language-use* usually becomes obvious when the source doesn't really understand a certain object, but he hides that, by using an evolved

	vocabulary and a more complex syntax (Nida 2004: 64)
Language's history	Consequently, the present linguistics, especially through the works of V. Thomsen and P. Kretschmer, on one hand, and of Vossler and of other several Italian linguists, on the other hand (as also due to the development of the individual linguistics, as there is the Romance *languages* one, a domain that has benefited of more numerous sources and respectively of several possibilities of following the *languages* in their historical development) has reached to consider the *language*'s history as being inseparable from the political and cultural history, as an aspect of the spiritual and cultural history or, even more than that, as being the history itself of the human spirit, studied from linguistic point of view, on the basis of the research material offered by the *languages*. This means a remarkable application of the historical point of view in linguistics, for, as we are going to see, for many times the formal history of the linguistic signs it didn't coincide to their cultural history: a sign can formally have an origin, but it can also have a totally different cultural origin (Coșeriu 1999: 58)

The *languages*' history isn't perfectly parallel to the social and cultural history. The *languages* are much more complex phenomena than the diverse forms of the civilization (Coșeriu 1999: 58-59)

Often, the formal history of the signs it doesn't coincide to their cultural history and that, consequently, the complete history of a linguistic sign cannot be done except in relation with the concepts designated by that sign (Coșeriu 1999: 59)

The science studying the development of a *language*, considered as a unique whole and in relation with the other aspects of the speakers' history, it is called as the history of the *language*. Namely, while the historical grammar studies synchronically the facts of a *language* in their internal reports (inside the system), the history of the *language* studies the system's development in its "external" relations or in connection with the political, cultural, and social history of that community (Coșeriu 1999: 99-100)

The history sees the *language* in its creation and it shows if what is presented in the description as an applicable procedure, as materializable virtuality, it has been or not effectively concretized. The history doesn't explain, as many linguists think (or say), the present with the help of the past but, by keeping the terms, the present with the help of the future. Of course, the future as such – "the future" relatedly to this "present' moment – it cannot be a subject of the science; in order to be that possible, it must become a "past" (knowledge, and therefore true science, it exists only for the past), namely it must be "future" only relatedly to another "past" previous to this past (Coșeriu 2009: 336) |

Language's meta-*language-use*	The point of major interest of Augustine (Saint Augustine, E. l. t.'s n.) it consists of the terms having inherent metalinguistic value, the words signifying "types of signs' existence", which therefore classify the signs, and they do not have themselves in their sight, in the first place, but only to the extent they can occupy a place in this classification; thus, for instance, in the terminology of Saint Augustine, the word *nomen* designates a vast class of words, which this word itself belongs to. If, on the opposite, *nomen* is uses with the sense of *suppositio materialis*, as *vox nominis*, the "word *nomen*" no longer designates a class, but an object, namely on itself. Depending on what constitutes the object of the classification – expressions signifying "types of signs' existence" (…) - it turns out a different status of the respective term and, in total, a complicated network of relations (Coșeriu 2011: 176)
Language's model as organon	The *language*'s model as organon, it was proposed by Karl Bühler. The proposed model is, I repeat that, only a starting point of the discussion – because we will immediately see that through successive modification and completions of this model we will get closer to our goal; the clarification of the meaning's building up. To Bühler, the linguistic signs is, first of all, only a material fact (in other words he treated the linguistic sign as signifier) and it is in a triadic report with what surrounds it, more exactly said, it functions as a signs just through this triadic report. The three *relata* are: the speaker, who exteriorizes the signs (the "emitter"), the listener who perceives the sign (the "recipient"), and the circumstances which the signs addresses to, which are spoken about. Through this model of the sign, which (…) he called as "the *language*'s model as organon", Bühler wanted to offer a determination, in a schematic form, of the functions of the linguistic sign (…) the sign is an *organon*, and instrument which somebody tell to somebody else through, something about things (Coșeriu 2013: 85-87)
Language's norm	The norm and the system of the *language* correspond, in ensemble, approximately, to the Saussurian concept of *langue* (Coșeriu 2000: 277) The norm of the *language*, instead, it contains everything that, in the corresponding speaking of a functional *language*, it is traditional, common, and constant, though necessarily functional: everything that is said (as it is understood) "so, and not in another mode". We've seen, for instance, that in English the unvoiced occlusive consonants – especially in certain positions inside the word (but never after "s") – are pronounced aspirated. Well, this is the normal mode of their materialization and they are pronounced like that despite the fact that the aspiration isn't functional in English; consequently, the inter-comprehension would be present, equally, even when they are pronounced not-aspired (Coșeriu 2000: 280-281)

	The norm, consequently, it requires on certain cases the materialization of some unfunctional traits and their eventual redundancy (Coșeriu 2000: 281)
	The norm is, in a sense, ampler than the system: rightly so, it contains unfunctional traits too, while the system contains only the distinctive traits necessary for a *language* unity (on the plan of the expression or on the plan of the content) not to be confounded with another (Coșeriu 2000: 281)
	The norm contains effectively materialized and existent in tradition facts (Coșeriu 2000: 283)
Language's potential	A certain formulation, called by Chomsky as: "performance" (Chomsky, 1965) (Nida 2004: 50)
Language's stage – of the synchronic *language*	In the synchronic *language*'s stage, it is necessary to distinguish between two traditions: the free technique of the discourse and the repeated discourse. The free technique comprises the constitutive element of the "actual" *language* regarding their modifying and combining, namely the "words", the instruments, and the lexical and grammatical procedures; the repeated discourse, instead, it comprises everything that in the speaking of a community it repeats, in a more or less identical form, an already made discourse, or a more or less fix combination as a fragment, longer or shorter, of "what has already been said" (Coșeriu 2000: 258-259)
Language's structure	The fact that the linguistic technique is structured (it present functional oppositions in expression and in content) it constitutes the "structure" of the *language*. (…) The fact that amongst the unit of the same functional *language*, namely of a unitary and homogenous *language*, subsist certain relations, it represents the "internal structure" or, simply, the structure of that *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 277)
Language's *system*	The *language*'s norm and system, they correspond, in ensemble, approximately, to the Saussurian concept of *langue* (French) (Coșeriu 2000: 277)
	The system contains only the functional oppositions: what in an idiomatic technique it is distinctive and which, by the fact that they are different, they would have (or they would be) another *language* function, or they wouldn't have (or they wouldn't be) either a function in the considered functional *language*, and they could, eventually, to become unrecognizable (or incomprehensible). Consequently, all the traits ascertained as distinctive, they belong to the system (Coșeriu 2000: 281)
	The system if an open technique which, virtually, it contains unaccomplished facts too, but possible in the virtues of the system's distinctive oppositions and rules of combining, which

	govern the system's use. In this sense, let's consider, for instance, the forming of the words (Coșeriu 2000: 283) Grace to the system, which in essence it is a system of possibilities – a *language* isn't only what has been already said through its technique, but it is also what one can do with the same technique: it isn't only a "past" and a "present', but it also has a future dimension (Coșeriu 2000: 284)
Languages admixture	Partial persistence of the defeated language under the new form which, in the same region, it is adopted by the victor *language* (Coșeriu 1999: 78)
Languages family	To the so-called "*languages* family" from the comparative-historical linguistics it corresponds, in the texts' science, the literary species. Like a certain linguistic type doesn't' coincide to a *languages* family, likewise either a literary species doesn't coincide at all to a certain type of text (…) the *languages* families and the "texts families" are, from historical perspective, individuals (…) in the description and in the historiography of the *languages* families and of the texts families, are valid the same things as in the description of the individual *languages* and texts (Coșeriu 2013: 169-170)
Languages′ tendencies theory	A little different rectification of the same theory of the substratum it is the theory of the languages' tendencies, sustained especially by Antoine Meillet. Meillet affirms that the languages belonging to the same family they often present identical tendencies, produced or not by a substratum and which can lead to identical or similar linguistic changes, even when amongst these languages there aren't direct relations or territorial contiguity. So, for instance, in the "vulgar" Latin there already was the "tendency" of transforming in analytic the synthetic forms of the classic Latin (for instance, the grammatical cases or the passive diathesis of the tenses derived from the theme of the present); and this tendency manifested in the Romance languages continuing its effects after the dissolution of the pre-Romanic unity too. In this way would be explained, amongst other phenomena, the almost total disappearance of the Latin declination, disappearance occurred in the Romance languages in different époques. Doubtlessly, we can admit that there is something true in this theory, given the fact that, rightly so, there have been ascertained that identical phenomena can take place in different époques and places, without being amongst them a direct relation; although, it is rather questionable that an entire series of identical phenomena would take place, in the virtue of a supposed "tendency", in different languages and independently in each of them (Coșeriu 1999: 83)
Languages′ typology	An analogue activity exists, besides, on the level of the individual languages too: the typology of the languages. The languages types, as that one "isolating", agglutinating", of "flexional" (to mention only a few traditional terms), the behave on the level of the individual languages as the "types of texts" on level of the

	concrete texts. These types articulate the multiplicity of the "techniques of speaking" historically conveyed, without characterizing any of these techniques as exhaustively as does it the definition of the "equilateral triangle", in what concern the objects falling under its incidence (Coșeriu 2013: 169)
Language-use	The human *language-use* it is the faculty, the human function, essentially social, of constituting a *language* (F. de Saussure, 1998: 37)
	Any signs system serving for expressing and communicating ideas and sentiments or contents of the conscience (Coșeriu 1999: 15)
	We can call as "*language-use*" any signs system serving to intercommunication, namely to communicate ideas or psychic states between two or amongst several individuals. Often, it is called as *language-use* any communication type amongst beings capable of expressing themselves, either human or animals; really, expressions facts have been ascertained at animals too. So, for instance, there have been done studies on bees' *language-use*; the psychologists have studied, also, other signifier expressions met at animals: horses, dogs etc. Despite all these, the linguists don't accept the animal *language-use* as object of the linguistic research, because they don't recognize in it the essential characteristics of the human *language-use*. Rightly so, when the animals' expressions are considered as *language-use*(s), namely as signs systems, to this last term (sign) it is attributed a very wide meaning and, partially, this is questionable (Coșeriu 1999: 19)
	It remain therefore, established, that the signs of the human *language-use* have always a symbolic value, namely a value not residing in the material signs as such, a value which the signs only refer to (Coșeriu 1999: 21)
	In *language-use* there is an identity between intuition and expression, for each individual who speaks, he integrally expresses, for himself, the contents of his conscience, but there isn't identity between expression and communication, between expression and reception, between the expression of an individual "A" and the intuition which the same thing produces to an individual called "B" (Coșeriu 1999: 24)
	As one knows, the *language-use* is an especially complex phenomenon: it presents purely physical aspects (the sounds) and physiological aspects, psychic aspects, and logical aspects, individual aspects, and social aspects. Consequently, the linguists and the theoreticians of the *language-use*, depending on their philosophical (explicit or implicit) orientation, they highlight ones or others of these aspects, often considered as predominant, in the detriment of others (Coșeriu 1999: 47)

The logicians occupying themselves with the *language-use*, and the linguists of logical orientation, they pay attention especially to the so-called "logical aspect" of the *language-use*, namely to the aspect of pure symbolical communication of the concepts: to be seen, in this sense, the studies dedicated by Bertrand Russell to the linguistic problems. The fundamental idea of the logicians which, in a certain sense, it corresponds to the idea already met at Humboldt, under the name of internal form (Sprachform), but an "internal form" understood as universal, it is that of a "primary and a priory ideal skeleton", which would be effectively filled up and dressed up, by any *language*, with empirical material, in a different manner, obeying some general human motives, either some empirical accidental and changing motives (Husserl). Consequently, the logicians have in their sight, firstly, an abstract *language-use* and not the *language-use* as historical phenomenon, they occupying themselves, on normative purposes, with the study of a scientifically "useful" *language-use*, in other words, as adequate as possible to expressing the ideas (and they do not study the concrete *language-use*, which the linguists speak about). They study the *language-use* especially related to the speaker individual. One of the main centers of interest to the logicians it is that of the concordance between grammars and logics, namely between the *language-use*'s logics and the logics itself (Coșeriu 1999: 47-48)

On the opposite pole there are the psychologism followers, who often consider the *language-use* as an ensemble of purely psyching facts (Coșeriu 1999: 48)

This tendency is being manifested by other linguists too, as Vendryes and, especially, by Jespersen, who argues that, at least at its origin, the *language-use* had nothing to do with the communication, being an expression of the sociability instinct, the manifestation of psyching charge, a certain type of sentimental explosion, namely some kind of song or a simple shout, which an individual was making contact with another individual. The behavioristic psychology goes even further, by starting from its studies on the behavior of some superior animals and from some expression facts recorded at those animals, and it tends to interpret the man's symbolic activity too, in a causalist frame, and of purely psycho-physical "contexts" (Coșeriu 1999: 49)

No one of these two orientations can be upheld today, in the light of a realistic vision upon *language-use*, and from the point of view of the historical consideration of the linguistic phenomena as cultural social phenomena. If we accept the definition we have given to the concrete fact of speaking, namely to the linguistic act, then we will have to recognize in the *language-use* a logical

aspect and a psycho-affective aspect, which interfere with one another, and which can alternatively prevail, but without reaching the reciprocal exclusion (Coșeriu 1999: 49)

By determining the *language-use* as energeia, we have reached a decisive point. The *language-use* is now a free activity to us. It depends, so, on what is specifically human, for only the man is, in a free manner, active (Coșeriu 2009: 44)

By bringing on foreground the *language-use*'s instrumentality, its possibilities of being used, one often reaches to consider as basic and definitory function that fact which the already constituted *language-use* it can be employed for, that fact which, the *language-use* makes it possible, or it facilitates it; namely it is determined the essence of the *language-use* not through its internal finality, which constitutes its primary motivation, but through its external use (Coșeriu 2009: 44)

Another reduction is that of understanding the *language-use* as instrument of the practical life, of handling the persons or the things. Such a reduction finds it justification in the fact that, really, the *language-use* can be employed on practical purposes, and it even facilitates, on a certain measure, many forms of the practical life. But we must ask ourselves why, on those purposes, it was necessary to be constituted conceptual significations, because, strictly speaking, for the practical handling with the world, the concept isn't, in reality, absolutely necessary (Coșeriu 2009: 45)

The union between expression and signified it is called, usually, as sign. In accordance with this, we should interpret the linguistic fact through what is characteristic to the sign and we should consider the *language-use* as a partial domain in the ample world of the signs. Although, when it comes about *language-use*, sign is, without any doubt, a very comfortable and useful term, but only if it is correctly interpreted, better said, if are understood as intra-linguistic the sign's two faces: the expression and the content, the "signifier" and the "signified". The sign doesn't stand for " another things" (for what is extralinguistic), but it can be oriented towards designating the extralinguistic. Instead, using the term sign produces the impression that, before the *language-use*, there would already exist a signandum; and in this mode one can easily reach to conceive the *language-use* as a simple system of designation ("nomenclature") for already given, as such, "things". If such a conception was adopted, to the *language-use* domain would remain only the material sign, while the content would be considered as something extralinguistic (Coșeriu 2009: 46)

Actually, the *language-use* isn't, in the first place, usage, but creation of signified and, that's why, it isn't either a simple

162

production of material signs for already given significations, but it is creation of content and expression, in the same time (Coșeriu 2009: 47)

One can say that the *language-use* as energeia it is, in a sole act, knowledge and form of fixing and objectifying the knowledge itself (Coșeriu 2009: 47)

Important and essential it that the *language-use* makes the things accessible to the objective investigation, a fact that can be considered as basic principle of the science. In other words, the things' world (or of the "objects") it is given to the man, but only through the mediation of the significations: through the mediation of the linguistic configuration. And just the *language-use* is that one sharing the "objects" to the sciences (Coșeriu 2009: 48)

As unit of expression and intuition, as pure creation of signified and of "signs", the *language-use* – it we will consider the creator subject as absolute (namely, only in relation with what he creates) – it can be considered as equivalent to the poetry, or to the art by and large, which is just the first step in understanding the being. (Beside, this is the proper meaning of identifying between *language-use* and poetry). A s the poetry as well, the *language-use* is objectivation of intuitive contents of the conscience; and, like the poetry too, the *language-use* is anterior to the distinction between truth and falseness, and between inexistence and existence. The pure *language-use* is, therefore, poetry (Coșeriu 2009: 50-51)

We must ask ourselves if the *language-use* as such it is "absolute", namely, if by understanding it like an absolute subject, we consider it properly as *language-use*. Actually, the objectifying the intuition, the relations between the creator of *language-use* and his creation, it is only one of the *language-use*'s dimensions. The *language-use* has, though, another dimension too, which is given by the subject's "alterity", by the fact that the subject who creates *language-use* he presupposes other subjects, namely the opening of the conscience creator of *language-use*, towards other consciences (Coșeriu 2009: 52)

It has been said and it continues to be said that the *language-use* it is a social fact and that the *language* it is simply "imposed" to the speakers. In reality, the *language-use* is rather a foundation and in the same time primary manifestation of the social, of that man's "to-be-with-another", and the *language* isn't "mandatory" as external imposition, btu as assumed obligation (this is, besides, the genuine and original meaning of the Latin word: obligatio). The *language-use*, consequently, it is also an expression of the intersubjectivity and just in the double meaning of the solidarity

163

with a historical tradition and of the solidarity "contemporary" to a speaking community, which is historical too (Coșeriu 2009: 52)

The *language-use*, it always present itself as "*language*", in other words, as *language-use* developed in history and historically determined. The *language-use* is understanding of the being, but not from an absolute subject, neither of the empirical individual, but from the part of the historical individual, who, just because of that, he is, in the same time, a social entity too (Coșeriu 2009: 52)

The *language-use* is fundamental for defining the man. On one hand, it is logos, understanding of the being; on the other hand, it is intersubjective logos, form and expression of the man's historicity. The man lives in a linguistic world which he created himself as historical being. These are the two essential dimensions of the *language-use*: the subject-object dimension and the subject-subject dimension. As *language-use* by and large, the *language-use* it corresponds to the first dimension, to the man's relation with the being. As *language*, it corresponds, in the same time, to the relation with other people whom, just through the *language-use* itself, it is attributed the "humanity": the capacity of formulating questions upon the being and of interpreting the being (Coșeriu 2009: 52)

The *language-use* is oriented towards an object. By its semantic aspect, the *language-use* it corresponds to a phenomenon which "opposes" the *language*'s object: the *language-use* reproduces the reality of it corresponds to the being. In a certain way, which must be more closely specified, the *language-use* represents a conceiving of the reality, of the being. Thus, we could declare ourselves as satisfied if the *language-use*, as human activity, would have an absolute subject (Coșeriu 2011: 44)

The communication is essential for *language-use* (Coșeriu 2013: 96)

Due to the same reason which we have characterized for, the *language-use* as phenomenon implying the participation of at least two persons, we cannot either ignore the aspect of the communication, which can be a communication of sentiments, but also of ideas, of some concepts, namely of the facts of rational knowledge. Even more than that: it is without any doubt that the *language-use* it can be considered as fundamental form of our cognitive activity; rightly, our experience regarding the reality it is elaborated through the mediation of the rational activities of knowing and of discerning, and these ones are manifested in the linguistic signs, with the help of which (through their significations) we refer ourselves to the extralinguistic reality as to something "known" (Coșeriu 1999: 50)

164

The psychologist orientation needs, at its turn, several clarifications. First of all, for the *language-use* is the form of a cognitive content, constituted through several logical operations; secondly, because the *language-use* is a special function. Rightly, though as knowledge phenomenon, the *language-use* can be interpreted under psychological aspect (given the fact that any cognitive process implies a psychic process), by no means can be affirmed the fact that the predominant element in *language-use* it is constantly the "effective" factor, which the rationality wouldn't have anything to do. Without any doubt, when we speak, we express affective facts too; and one can even admit the existence of an affective or "stylistic" convention, a an "emotive" *language-use*, differing from the "enunciative" language. But the emotive *language-use* too, it is expressed in symbols which are products of a logical operation and it produces, at its turn, symbols which, if emptied of any emotive charge, they cross into the enunciative *language-use*, of pure communication. Given the fact that the *language-use* is a social fact needing at least two individuals, and having as prime condition the communication, in no case we could accept that it would have constituted simple manifestations of strictly individual psychic charges: even when we express such "charges", we cannot do it by using personal symbols, given the fact that the symbols, in order to be communicable, they must adapt to a norm which to be acceptable to the other members of our community, who we are talking to (Coșeriu 1999: 53)

The intelligibility must constitute the prime and indispensable condition of the *language-use* (Coșeriu 1999: 53)

Even more questionable is the behavioristic point of view. Without any doubt, the *language-use* is a psycho-physical fact too, and there is a psycho-physical apparatus conditioning it. But the central fact of the linguistic activity is situated beyond the limit which the physiology and the psychology can reach at, for it consists of the eminently spiritual faculty to establish a functional connection between a signifier and a signified, and it corresponds to some operations of the rationality, as there are the fact of knowing and the fact of distinguishing (Pagliaro). There isn't consequently, a possible analogy between the so-called "signs" belonging to the facts contexts, on the causality plan, and the signs of the human *language-use*, which are on the finality plan: the connection between signifier and signified isn't at all a necessary causal relation, but it is a human reaction. Likewise, there cannot be established effective analogies either between the expressions recorded at the superior animals and the human language, which doesn't consist of only expressing himself, but also in communicating through symbols. The animals, though having the capacity of manifesting certain psychic states and to make contact

with one another, they do not speak, namely in their expressions there are not symbols, it lacks the reference to objects through the mediation of the concepts, in a word, there doesn't' appear the capacity of signifying, a sine qua non trait of the human *language-use* (Coșeriu 1999: 54)

The important idea which we have to memorize from the sociologist orientation it is that the *language-use* can exist only within a community. But the limits themselves of the community, as rightly noticed Jespersen, they are conventional. In reality, an individual doesn't belong to a sole community, but he belongs to a variable number of communities, and he changes his way of speaking according to the community which he is within. The community can be the familiar nucleus, as it also can be a professional community, a regional or a national community and, sometimes, a supra-regional or supra-national community as, for instance, in the case of the Spanish *language* spoken not only in Spain, but in all the Hispano-American countries too (Coșeriu 1999: 57)

We've said that the *language-use* presents, first of all, a physical-physiological or phonic aspect. This constitutes the specific object of a science called as (general) phonetics: phone means in the Greek language "voice", and what the phonetics studies it is just the aspect of "voice" of the *language-use* and its sounds (Coșeriu 1999: 93)

The *language-use* is a system of signs and these signs call symbolically what it is though (signification)' or, the material signs are instruments for expressing and for communicating something which they are not identical to, and which they serve to only as external manifestation, namely as physical expression (Coșeriu 1999: 94)

We've seen that the *language-use* is historical concretized in systems of isoglosses called as *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 96)

According to the linguistic idealism, the *language-use* is a creation in its essence, being really studied only in its production, and not as technique or as practical use of an already produced *language-use* (Coșeriu 2000: 84)

The *language-use*'s production can be concretely ascertained in a acts of speaking and in the individual texts, especially in the literary texts, which will constitute, consequently, the main object of the research (Coșeriu 2000: 84)

The structuralism considers the *language-use*, first of all, as

communication means, namely it considers in its technical-instrumental aspect, being structure through the mediation of some objectively functional difference ("distinctive oppositions") (Coșeriu 2000: 84)

According to another current from the present linguistics, the "neo-Humboldtian" one – represented especially in Germany (by Jost, Leo Weinsgerber and their disciples) -, the *language-use* is fundamentally constituted of two layers: the first layer represents the immediate organizing of the world through the mediation of the *languages*, by configuring, in each case, some kind of "intermediary" world or "inter-universe" (in German: Zwischenwelt), while the second layer comprises the necessary procedures in order to speak in diverse situations within world, but by using the elements already given by this "inter-universe". The first layer essentially corresponds to the lexicon; the second layer it corresponds to the grammatical systems. Consequently, the basic linguistic discipline should be the lexicology, as study of the modality which the people structure in, primary, the universe. Truly, the most important and the most original contributions of the neo-Humboldtian current concern the lexicology. Likewise, the differences amongst *languages* remarked by the representatives of this current, are, first of all, the lexical ones, these ones being interpreted as deriving from "the vision about world", specific, represented by each *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 86)

The "Marrism", instead, it highlights the dialectical unit between *language-use* and thinking, a unity that would be manifested in the first place in the mode of structuring the sentences. Consequently, the syntax, especially in its "typological" form (practiced, actually, quite traditionally), it represents, to this current, the primary linguistic discipline (Coșeriu 2000: 86-87)

The *language-use* is an human universal activity doNe individually, but always according to some historically determined techniques ("*languages*"). Rightly so, all the adult and normal human being, they speak; in a way, they are always speaking (the contrary of the speaking it is the silence, which it can actually be conceived only relatedly to speaking: as being a "not speaking yet" or a "ceasing to speak"). On the other hand, each speaking subject speaks individually (inclusively in a dialogue): the *language-use* never is a "choral" activity. The *language-use* always is historically determined: as "*language*" – (Spanish, Italian, French, German etc.) (Coșeriu 2000: 235)

The *language-use* is concretized, without any doubt, in conformity to an achieve knowledge as such ("learnt") and it is presented under the form of some objective or "produced" facts. But, according to a famous characterization, formulated in Aristotelian

167

terms by W. von Humboldt, the *language-use* isn't in essence *epyov*, a done thing, a "product", but it is *evepyeict* creator activity (activity going beyond its own *uvauti*, "potency", namely, it exceeds the "learnt" technique). Consequently, it can be examined as *evepyeux*, and as *epyov* namely as creation fact (as creator activity or, at least, as activity), as technique fact ("potency", competence) and as product, on each of the three mentioned levels. The result of combining these three criteria (levels and viewpoints) it represents a distinction with nine "compartments" in the general structure of the *language-use* (Coșeriu 2000: 236-237)

The diverse definitions given to the *language-use* are due, partially to the diversity of viewpoints which the *language-use* is approached from, on this universal level. Thus, the one who defined the *language-use* as " activity using (or producing, or creating) signs", he considers it just as activity, as speaking. Who, instead, defines the *language-use* as "faculty of speaking" (or of "expressing"), he considers it as a knowledge, a competence, or a "potency". And a definition as that given (in a certain context) by Ludwig Wittgenstein – "the *language-use* is the totality of the phrases" – it refers, obviously, to the *language-use* as "product". Such a diversity of viewpoints it is ascertained regarding to the particular *languages* too, on the historical level of the *language-use*. The ancients conceived the *language* a concrete determination of the speaking; rightly so, in order to refer to the *languages* they were using special verbs (thus, in Greek, to speak the "Attica" *language*) or adverbs, namely determinations of an activity (thus, in the Latin language: latine loqui, graece loqui, namely, in a proper sense, "to speak Latin", "to speak Greek"). (Coșeriu 2000: 238)

A fundamental aspect of the *language-use* is that of always manifesting itself as a *language*; even being creation, continuous production of new elements and in this sense, "freedom", the *language-use* is, in the same time "historicity", historical technique, and tradition, solidarity with other present speakers, and with speakers from the past, namely with the present history and with the past history of a community of speakers. This so characteristic to the *language-use* fact, it has been clearly noticed by Giovanni Gentile, in a short chapter about the *language-use*, from his work Sommario di pedagogia, where he speaks about the freedom of the *language-use* related to the creation. (…) There isn't about a limitation of the freedom (as often it is believed to be), but it is about the historical dimension of the *language-use* which coincides to the man's historicity itself. On the other hand, the human liberty isn't an individual caprice, but it is historical freedom and, anyway, the *language* isn't "imposed" to the individual (as it is often affirmed): the individual uses the

language in order to manifest his expressive freedom. And this freedom is almost unlimited on the text's plan, where the meanings, though not the signified, can be and always are new (Coșeriu 2000: 250)

The *language-use* is double negation and suspension of the world. On one hand, the *language-use* is the construction of another world, of a world of significations, namely "mundus sensibilis" it is replaced for "mundus intelligibilis", which consists of types of existing. On the other hand, these types of existing – linguistic species – aren't the "real" species, existing through nature: in principle, they don't' only differ in each *language*, but they are the *language-use* itself, namely primarily, at least in virtual types of existing, possibilities of existence, whom there can partially correspond the "real" species and not the preexistent classes of "real objects" (Coșeriu 2009: 68)

The *language-use* is no "unnatural" than it doesn't even distinguish what is "true" from what is "false", what is "existent" from what is "nonexistent", namely it precedes these two distinctions when delimitating its types of existence. In reality, on lexical and grammatical level, the *language-use* doesn't treat the imaginary beings, as the unicorn for instance, differently than it treats the "real" horses (Coșeriu 2000: 68, nota 1)

The fact that the *language-use* is a condition for science it mustn't be interpreted, though, in the sense that the science would be conditioned by *language-use* or maybe by an individual *language* (for instance Romanian, German, etc.) or that the *language*-use by and large should be considered as a science – as sometimes it has been said. Rightly so, the science begins through *language-use*, but is exceeds the *language-use*; the science reviews, on the basis of some objective criteria, the delimitations made by the *language-use*. Also, the science discovers and it creates numerous new "things", previously unknown to the *language*, and it founds a new *language-use*, objectively justified, in order to serve the science's own necessities of designation, namely the "specialty *language-use*". At its turn, the *language-use* is a necessary condition to the science, for that "something" of the things it is indicated as such and it can be mediated only through *language-use*; the *language-use* in itself isn't a science, but neither is something "obscure". The *language-use* it delimitates the existing of the things and it deictically identified it as being "this-and-no-other", it represents it in speaking, but just because of that it doesn't say anything about this existence (in the naming act), at least explicitly or objectively founded, not even if that "is here" in a real mode (in reality, neither the derived or the composed ones do not exceed, in the *languages* as such, the very vague indications of relating or of classification (Coșeriu 2009: 70)

169

About the *language-use* regarded as creator of species:
"Of course, the *language-use* doesn't' produce trees as objects with concrete existence – (das Seiende), but it signals the presence of the trees. Besides this, it isn't important either the fact that this delimitation (the attribution of an existing) it is often done on the basis of their characteristics established just in the things, and that the linguistic species very often coincides to the species given by nature (on the opposite: the fact that certain linguistic species correspond to natural species can be ascertained later) and, anyway, the *language-use* isn't an imitative representation, but it is an intentional classification of the things" (Naturbild und Sprache", p. 281) (Coșeriu 2009: 70)

About the *language-use* regarded as a way towards accessing the things"
"Therefore, the signification contains only the mode of being of the object, namely to-be-like-that-and-not-otherwise, and not the existence object "in concrete mode" (Das Seiende). Only in the secondary mode the *language-use* can reach to designate the object through to-be-like-that-and-not-otherwise. But, for the pure possibility is something universal, the *language-use* can reach only through a secondary operation, of individualization, to designate the individual examples of the mode of to-be-like-that-and-not-otherwise… The designation is… a possibility of the *language-use*, at the basis of which it stays the *language-use* regarded as signification. The designation leads us now towards the things' world, a world reaching to be configured just through the *language-use*. So, the *language-use* makes possible the access to extralinguistic-ity, to the things themselves. That's why, the *language-use* can be an instrument of the practical life too, representing the extralinguistic world. But, essential is the fact that the *language-use* it makes the things accessible to our objective research. In this sense the *language-use* can be considered as a departure point and a basis for science." (Der Mensch und seine Sprache", in Ursprung und Wesen des Menschen, edited by H. Haag and F. P. Mohres, (lecture held at Tübingen in the summer semester 1966), (1968), p.76.) (Coșeriu 2009: 70-71)

(Self-quotation on the linguistic and scientific knowledge):
"Of course, in *languages* we have intuitive distinctions and limitations, which can be important hypotheses for sciences and/or philosophy. "scientific" or "philosophic" doesn't means, though, these intuitions as such, but just their exposition under the forms of enunciations and their real or rational justification: such intuitions are purely linguistic facts only when we speak about something "known", but still "not-recognized" (in Hegel's meaning). Also, these are to sciences and to philosophy only simple possibilities, which cannot bring any precise scientific

consideration in what regards them, but which neither can exclude such a consideration. From technical perspective it is easier: some problems are raised within a community whose *language* knows the diverse delimitations and distinctions and, from this perspective, a *language* can appear, to say so, post factum, as being "more scientific" or "more philosophical" in comparison to another *language*. The existence of such delimitations and distinctions in a *language* it doesn't represent, though, a guarantee of the fact that the mentioned problems will be discussed by the respective linguistic community, or that their inexistence excludes the mentioned scientific problems. For instance, it is easier that the ontological matters to be discussed in a community that has the verb "to be" and the derivatives from this verb; but we can have ontology even in communities which do not know the verb "to be", or there are numerous linguistic communities which, though having this verb, they haven't developed a scientific ontology. Likewise, the decided article corresponds to a fundamental distinction between "virtual" and "actual", between "concept" and "object", respectively between existence and the existent object (as in the case from the German *language* Mensch - der Mensch); the existence of the decided article in a *language* (for instance, in Basque or in Samoan) it doesn't imply, though, the idea that this distinction can be done ALSO in real mode, and the inexistence of the decided article (for instance in Latin or Russian) it doesn't exclude the fact that this distinction is made from scientific perspective, or philosophical." ("Naturbild und Sprache", pp. 277-278.) (Coșeriu 2009: 70-71)

The *language-use* as *language*, as linguistic technique constituted historically, it confirms that the man's characteristic time of his historical existence it is the future: in *language-use*, as also in the case of other activities characterizing the man, the man acts aiming the future; he creates and transforms the creation in knowledge, in the technique of a future activity (Coșeriu 2009: 339-337)

The time is represented by *language-use* and in *language-use*. The *language-use* designates and it structures the time with the help of the signified and by designating the time it represents it too, and it makes it objective; namely, the *language-use* it make out of time an object characteristic to the man's world, not in a different mode than it makes the things too, by making them just these of those things, related to some modalities of the being delimited as such and ordered in cosmos (Coșeriu 2009: 337)

About the *language-use* it has been said, actually, almost everything that was to say. But there has been said and it continues to be said also things – too many – which would have been better not to be said. (Coșeriu 2009: 36)

The first ascertainment regarding the *language-use* – and which, to say so, it imposes to us at first glance – it is that the *language-use* it appears, concretely, as a specific human activity and easily to be recognized, namely as speaking or discourse (Coșeriu 2009: 36)

The *language-use* itself can be employed, in its material hypostasis, as means of expression with subjective sense, but without objective signified (for instance, in order to manifest a soul's mood of the speaker). But just in this case, the *language-use* isn't being concretized as *language-use*. So, by reducing the *language-use* top a simple activity of subjective expression, we also remake that the objective signified it is essential to the manifestation of the *language-use* as such (Coșeriu 2009: 37)

Considering the *language-use* as speaking, it leads to equivalate the own function and, consequently, the *language-use*'s finality, to the function or to the types of functions of the speaking acts (Coșeriu 2009: 37)

The *language-use* as speaking, it is a speaking with another (Coșeriu 2009: 37)

The essence of the *language-use* is manifested in dialogue, in the "one's-speaking-with-another", in determining the other to do something for us or in our place (Coșeriu 2009: 38)

The *language-use* as speaking, it is concretized in each case according a determined and historically conditioned technique, namely in accord with a *language* (Coșeriu 2009: 38)

In reality (…) the *language-use*'s mode of being is, to say so, a "verbal" mode (being about an activity) and (…) the historical techniques of the speaking are, in the same time' adverbial", by being modalities of an activity (Coșeriu 2009: 39)

The study of the *language-use* as *language* it allows us to separate the *language-use* from the occasional conditionings of the speaking acts and, consequently, to get closer to what is universal in *language-use* and to consider the occasional purposes of the speaking as possibilities, and not as *language-use*'s essence (Coșeriu 2009: 39)

a) The *language-use* as creator activity can be placed (…) on the same plan with the other free activities of the man, as the art, the science, and the philosophy.
b) The creator character of the *language-use* mustn't either be overlooked when investigating the linguistic technique: the

172

	linguistic technique is, essentially, a system for creating new facts, and not only for repeating what it has already been done in the historically concretized *language*. c) the properly-said linguistic fact it must be explained in each case through function, and not through materiality. d) in order to interpret and to explain the linguistic facts the sole appropriate approach is the finalistic one, and not the causal one. e) Describing a *language*, it is wants to really be adequate to its object, it must present the *language* itself as a system for creating, a system of producing, and not as a product. (Coșeriu 2009: 43-44)
Language-use as object and the meta-*language-use* (at Aquinas)	Like Augustine too, Thomas Aquinas distinguished between the *language-use* as object and the meta-*language-use*. Against the common opinion that the verbs are destined to occupy the position of the predicate in a sentence, Thomas Aquinas thought that one could object that the verbs can appear in the position of the subject too; this thing would be possible, though, only in very specific conditions (Coșeriu 2011: 202)
Language-use fact / linguistic act / linguistic fact	Each *language-use* fact, each linguistic act it is in the same time a physical and physiological phenomenon, through its phonic aspect (articulated sounds), a psychic phenomenon (through the psychic process presupposed by the producing, by the perceiving, and by the using of the sounds) and an intellectual or rational phenomenon (through the sign's significance: by the fact that the signs are symbols implying a logical, rational, referring to knowledge) operation (Coșeriu 1999: 92) "Conceptual" doesn't mean "rational" or "logical" yet, and reducing the linguistic fact or the conceptual fact to the rational logos it is an arbitrary simplification of the "what can be said" (…), of the logos in its entirety (Coșeriu 2009: 45) The linguistic fact is, obviously, and expression having a signified, or an expression and a signified in the same time (Coșeriu 2009: 46)
Language-use(articulated)'s basic reality	In the articulated *language-use* we distinguish two basic realities: the linguistic act and the *language* or the *system* which the linguistic act corresponds to (Coșeriu 1999: 15)
Language-use's alterity	The *language-use* has another dimension too, which is given by the subject's "alterity", namely by the fact that the subject creator of *language-use* presupposes other subjects, namely the opening of the conscience creator of *language-use* towards other consciences. (…) The *language-use* is always directed towards another subject, even in quality as primary linguistic creation. The significations and the signs do not create only "in order to exist" (as in art), but they create in order to exist for other individuals, and even more: as already belonging to other individuals too (one actually created, always, in a determined *language*) (Coșeriu

2009: 51)

Such an individual who, from the point of view of his activity – the speaking -, he is only one of the possible subjects who, by being in relation with others through the mediation of this activity, they gain a special dimension which, together with Antonino Pagliaro, I call it alterity. This "alterity" can be determined under two aspects. We speak like "others", in order to be able to "speak with others"; the subject of an activity recognizes "outside himself" other subjects in order to be able to open himself towards them. (…) Even when the *language-use's* subject manifests himself in creative mode, when he isn't content only to use something already created, he still recognizes "outside himself" other subjects of the same activity (Coșeriu 2011: 44)

The dimension of the "alterity" causes a relativization of the involved subjects. The subject realizes that other subjects can understand him and they can conceive him even as an object, likewise he, at his turn, conceived them as objects. An unmediated perceiving of the others it isn't possible. The other constitute objects of the own perceiving, likewise all the other objects, or states of circumstances. Only through *language-use* which, in its intersubjective dimension – the alterity – it correlates its subjects, a subject is in the situation of not only recognizing others as objects, but also to recognize their subjectivity in a mediated manner (Coșeriu 2009: 47)

Language-use's concrete reality	The concrete reality of the *language-use* it is the linguistic act of employing for communication one or several signs of the articulated *language-use*: a word, a phrase, when uttered, they are linguistic acts (Coșeriu 1999: 15)
Language-use's constant general properties	The *language-use* is a general-human activity which, on one hand, it is individually materialized or exercised, by any man; on the other hand, though, each individual observes the norms established historically, and founded on common traditions, speaking thus, for instance, the German *language*, the English *language*, the French *language* etc. on the basis of a certain tradition of the speaking, resulted through historical becoming (Coșeriu 2013: 25)
Language-use's epistemological value	Th true purpose aimed by Augustine in the dialogue entitled De Magistro, it is that of questioning the value of the language-use as instrument of knowledge. What it is firstly said regarding the objective-linguistic or metalinguistic use of the words it represents an exercise of thinking and of refining our attention in order to discuss the problems posed by the report between perception, thinking, and language-use. Here no longer is, as at the previous thinkers, about an unmediated knowledge, but it is about a cognitive demarch intermediated by a professor, by a "teacher" (Coșeriu 2011: 182)
Language-use's	The linguistic acts and the systems integrated by them (*languages*)

constitutive facts	(Coșeriu 1999: 92)
Language-use's faculty	(only mentioned at Coșeriu 2000: 10, 11)
Language-use's finality	The communication represents the finality of the *language-use* (Coșeriu 1999: 16)
Language-use's functions	Expressive, cognitive, egocentric, informative, imperative, performative, emotive, and phatic (Nida 2004: 16)
Language-use's level	Here it is about the level of these phenomena which are common to any speaking and to all *languages* (Coșeriu 2013: 63)
Language-use's philosophy	The *language-use*'s philosophy doesn't study the *language-use* in itself and for itself, but relatedly to other human activities – firstly in relation with the thinking (and this is the reason why it is occupy itself in a more special manner with the semantics or with the science about signification) – trying to establish the essence and the place of the *language-use* amongst the phenomena which express the essence of the man. The fundamental problem of the *language-use*'s philosophy is to answer the question: "What the *language-use* is?" (Coșeriu 1999: 17) The *language-use*'s philosophy is based on a certain philosophical conception and only in relation with that conception it refers to the concrete linguistic phenomena. Consequently, it doesn't have any descriptive finality, or any finality of systematizing the linguistic facts empirically ascertained (Coșeriu 1999: 18) The entire *language-use*'s philosophy dignified to bear this name, as also any conscious linguistics oriented towards its task, it should insists especially upon the linguistic creativity (which, on the other hand, it impregnates the speaking techniques, these ones being in essence, open) (Coșeriu 2000: 239) The *language-use*'s philosophy occupies itself with the *language-use*'s essence itself and, because of this, the problems specific to the *language-use*'s philosophy can no longer be formulated (or not only) "inside the *language*"; they must cross beyond the linguistic frame. In the frame of the *language-use*'s philosophy, the *language* must be studied in relation with the other human activities and by and large in relation with the human essence. But due to its research object, the *language-use*'s philosophy remains tied to the general linguistics and to the *language-use*'s theory. These two disciplines occupy themselves with the question "what is like" concerning the *language-use* and the *languages*, while the *language-use* philosophy it orients itself rather towards "what", namely towards the *language-use*'s meaning by and large (Coșeriu 2011: 40)
Language-use's psychology	The psychic aspect of the linguistic activity is studies by the *language-use*'s psychology, a science, as it has been said,

	cultivated especially by psychologists, but which influences as well, the researches of many linguists, mainly under theoretical aspect (Coșeriu 1999: 95)
Language-use's theory	The theory of the language-use belong to the domain of the general sciences (…) it starting point is situated "inside the language-use" and the theory starts from language-use and from languages as identification objects and previously delimited. (…) regarding the formulation of the questions and the answers to them, the language-use's theory follows the opposite direction (than that of the general linguistics, E. l. t.'s n.): at the beginning it is situated the theory with its concepts, in a tight correlation with one another, as for instance the "language-use in general", "individual language", "word", "sentence" etc. and starting from these ones are followed then, theoretically, and deduced, certain traits. The traits deduces on this way have the character of certain definitory criteria; the constitute actually – in the terminology used today – the "linguistic universals" themselves (Coșeriu 2011: 40)
Language-use's sounds	In these phonic continuums (see phonetic content in the present dictionary) we isolate and identify the *language-use*'s sounds (Coșeriu 1999: 103) The concepts of: intensity (accent), musical pitch (tonality or tone), and duration (quantity) are, in the *languages*' phonetics, relative concepts; in other words, there aren't' *language-use*'s sound which to be by themselves and in an absolute sense, high or long: they are such, only in comparison to other sound, atonic, grave, or short (or less intense, less high, and less long) of the same way of speaking or of the same linguistic act (Coșeriu 1999: 105-106) Nowadays, the distinction between sound and letters is, in linguistics, an elementary distinction (Coșeriu 1999: 130)
Levels of functional units (in *languages*)	(…) in *languages* we should distinguish three levels of functional units: a) archi-units: units existing in case of neutralization (or, by and large, in the non-distinction cases); b) units: units existing in primary oppositions; c) hypo-units: units existing in the cases of sub-distinction (Coșeriu 2000: 215)
Levels of *language-use*	In *language-use*, there can be distinguished three levels: a universal level, a historical level, and an individual level, levels which, on the other hand, are more or less clearly distinguished from practical point of view. For instance, when we say about a child that he doesn't speak yet, we do not mean the Spanish or any other *language*, but we means that he doesn't uses, for now, the general faculty of speaking: we refer to the universal level. Also, we are on the universal level when we hear in the next room somebody speaking, but we do not understand what is being said

	and we to not identity the speaking persons. On this level, one can notice "symptomatic" aspects of the *language-use*, but, by not understanding the linguistic signified itself, we might be tempted to give wrong interpretations. Thus, by no knowing the *language*, neither the character of the person who speaks, we can interpret a noisy discussion – but cordial one – as a dispute. Likewise, by hearing somebody speaking in a foreign *language*, we can have, on the universal level, the impression of a furious speaking, which it can be about only a prosodic particularity of the respective *language*. (…) These three levels are, up to a point, autonomous. Thus, the universal level follows own rules (starting with the simply material aspects of the voice), creating also own possibilities, regardless the individual *languages*. Analogically, it is not the case to consider the individual level as a simple concretization of a certain historicity, for on this level we meet polyglot speakers who know and who materialize certain historical traditions and, on the other hand, no individual can concretize the whole historical tradition by himself. That's why, in a sense, the individual level exceeds the historical level, given that a sole speaker can speak more than a *language*. IN another sense, this level is more limited than the historical level, because no speaker totally materializes a *language*: no Spaniard know the whole Spanish *language*, no English knows the whole English *language* and so on. We cannot be sure even relatedly to a text that it would correspond to a unique historical tradition, because in a text in a certain *language*, there can appear also elements belonging to other linguistic traditions, presented or not, as such, by the speaker (or by the writer). These elements will be indicate, if the speaker explicitly says (or he hints to) that he uses words from another *language* (let's think at locutions as *grosso modo*, *ex novo* used in the Spanish texts); being omitted, for instance, if they are "mistakes" caused by a reduced knowledge of another *language*, namely through an interference between two systems, mistakes which can imply the "erroneously" applying or, on the opposite, the suspension, namely the non-applying of the rules belonging to the two systems. An interference of this type, it can occur when a person, by knowing better another *language* which some forms of his maternal *language* have an obscene meaning, he avoids using them in his own *language* - in such a case we have a "negative" interference (Coşeriu 2000: 236)
Levels of the linguistic knowledge	There can be distinguished diverse techniques of the peaking: the technique of the speaking, by and large, the historical language which, at its turn, it represents a technique too, and the texts' technique, namely knowing the mode what certain texts, or certain types of texts, are formed like. To these three different techniques, which you can find the three levels of the language-use's sphere in, are corresponding three different levels of the linguistic knowledge which I, in another place, I am going to call them as "linguistic values" or "levels of the competence". And to these

	three levels correspond, again, different criteria of evaluating the speaking. In other words, the success of the act of speaking it is evaluated differently on each one of the three levels of the linguistic knowledge (Coșeriu 2013: 71)
Lexematic(s)	The structural lexicology (the "lexematic(s)") it is being developed nowadays (Coșeriu 2000: 156)
Lexia	Lexical element bearing the signification of certain technologies; second element of scholar composing, signifying: "referring to speaking", "of lexicon", "lexical"; any significative element of the lexicon: word or expression (www.Dex.ro)
	Lexical signified (attributed to sciences) By attributing the lexical signified to the sciences of the things, L. Bloomfield was, consequently, right, in what regards the technical *language-use*; but, in the same time, he was wrong by attributing to the sciences of the things any lexical signified, namely, considering, actually, any signified as being "technical"; the definition of the "signified" of the 300,000 chemical terms, it belongs, of course, to the chemistry, but there is no other science which we could ask for the definition of some signified as "to walk", "to bring", "to ask for", "to want" – these ones being contents of *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 255)
Lexicography	Given that the fact the term of lexicography designates, especially in the applied lexicography, the art of making dictionaries (Coșeriu 1999: 94) Lexicography is a discipline of the linguistics establishing the principles and the practical methods of making dictionaries; the totality of the dictionaries (from a country, from an epoque, from a domain etc.) (www.Dex.ro)
Lexicology	Branch of the linguistics occupying itself with the study of the lexicon of a *language* (www.Dex.ro)
Lexicon	Technical or encyclopedic dictionary, usually in several volumes, comprising orientating knowledge form certain domains; encyclopedia (of a domain); lexicographic work comprising the words of a *language*, of an activity domain, of an author etc. (www.Dex.ro)
Linearity of the speaking	The linearity of the peaking it is unfolding and succession, it is dynamic linearity (Coșeriu 2009: 352)
Lingua franca	It is about speaking, belonging or not, to a community, as dialect of as a national *language*, but which are used by populations of different nationalities or *languages*, especially in their trade relations and in the relations with the strangers: thus are: Swahili, Bantu, Pidgin-English etc. (Coșeriu 1999: 46)
Linguist	The linguist has in his sight the comparative criterion; the linguist is interested in the linguistic side of the texts; the linguist can be interested in any text and, especially, not only the written texts but also the spoken *language*, the linguist can be interested in any text for the text itself, even if, eventually, it would lack any

	informative value; the linguist doesn't approach the philology as political, social, or historical science; the linguist is interested in a text only on the measure that information can elucidate linguistic facts (Coșeriu 1999: 13-14)
Linguistic act / linguistic acts	A word, a phrase, actually uttered, they are linguistic acts. The linguistic acts (…) are never totally identical, but they vary from individual to individual, differentiating even at the same individual according to circumstances, both in what regards their material form and their signification, of, better said, their "content" (Coșeriu 1999: 15-16)
	In concrete form, there do not exist *languages*, but there are only linguistic acts of expression and communication, differing from an individual to another, and even at the seme individual, depending on circumstances (Coșeriu 1999: 24)
	By always being the expression of a totally new and unique intuition, the linguistic act is a creation act, a singular act that doesn't reproduce in an exact manner any previous linguistic act, and which, only by the limits imposed to it by the necessity of the social communication it "resembles" to other previous linguistic acts which belong to the common experience of a community. Namely, the linguistic act is, by its nature, an eminently individual act, but socially determined by its finality itself, finality that is "to say somebody something regarding something" (Coșeriu 1999: 24)
	Valuing the linguistic act as fundamental aspect of the *language-use* it is due, firstly, to W. von Humboldt, considered, rightly, the founder of the general linguistics. Truly, Humboldt, in the introduction to his work on kawi *language* from the Island of Jawa (work published posthumously, in the year 1836), he was the first to discern between the two fundamental aspect of the *language-use*: on one hand there is the *language-use* as *energeia*, namely as continuous creation of individual linguistic acts, as something dynamic which isn't made once and forever, but it is continuously done and, on the other hand, the *language-use* as *ergon*, in other words, as 'product" or "made thing", as historically achieved system ("*language*"). With this distinction, Humboldt gave a new orientation to the linguistic studies, but it wasn't take in account at that time about most of its implications and during almost the entire past century the most part of the linguists continued to speak about *languages* as some phenomena independent from individuals (Coșeriu 1999: 26-27)
	There are, naturally, linguistic acts which, in a certain sense could be considered as purely individual, as there is the monologue or the speaking to oneself. But such linguistic acts reveals us only that the *language-use* is a habit, because we are talking to

ourselves as we would consider ourselves as doubled: we are talking "to ourselves" the *language* of our community, in the same way we would communicate to someone differing from us. The same thing unveils us, also, that the linguistic act doesn't exclusively belong to an individual, as Saussure affirmed, but it is, simultaneously, an individual fact and a social fact: individual fact for the speaking individual doesn't integrally create his own expression, but he rather recreates it according to the previous models, namely he necessarily obeys what constitutes the norm within his community and he doesn't get too far from this norm, because otherwise he would risk to not be understood (Coșeriu 1999: 28)

Consequently, it remains established that the linguistic act, as relation act between at least two individuals, it necessarily implies: an intuition and an expression of the individual A and a perceiving and an image (a new intuition) of a individual B. This complexity of the linguistic act it reflects the complexity itself of the *language-use* and it constitutes, in the same time, the intimate motif of the linguistic change. Rightly, a linguistic act of the individual A it is created according to the model of previous linguistic acts, but it is never totally identical to them (Coșeriu 1999: 29)

The linguistic acts taking place in a community are only more or less common but, in order to study them from scientific point of view, we make abstraction of the aspects which differentiate these acts. It is about a totally justified abstraction, analogue to that one made, for instance, by the botanist while studying the tree, letting aside all the particularities belonging to the individual trees and not to the tree as class (Coșeriu 1999: 32)

In the individual linguistic acts there is always a personal invention portion, but the invention cannot exceed certain limits and it must be accepted in the environment which it occurs in. The new linguistic acts cannot get too far from the models existing in the traditional system, for they still must respect certain norms of the system itself and, they must be accepted by the respective community. It is what one can notice, usually, when we say that the use "consecrates" the new terms and formulas (Coșeriu 1999: 65)

Linguistic acts or "enunciations" (Coșeriu 2000: 126)

Linguistic change	The linguists' attention has been focuses until now especially upon the historical level of the linguistic technique, namely upon *languages*: the linguistics – the "modern" one not less than the "traditional" one – it has been substantially a linguistic of the *languages*. Or, no matter how much this would be due to some

	indubitable research and teaching needs, it is not legitimate to be ignored the importance of the two other plans (Coșeriu 2000: 239) (only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2009: 350)
Linguistic community	The linguistic community exercises upon speaking a double action, a twofold "control": it limits the invention and, on the other hand, it accepts and it rejects the innovations, according to some difficult to accept norms and which, by and large, are related to motifs of cultural prestige, but also to other motifs as the clarity of the expression, the comfort, the expressivity etc. (Coșeriu 1999: 66)
Linguistic configuration	Important and essential is the fact that the *language-use* makes the things accessible to the objective investigation, a fact that can be considered as basic principle of the science. In other words, the world of the things (or of the "objects") it is given to the man, but only through the mediation of the significations, through the mediation of the linguistic configuration. And just the *language-use* is the one sharing "objects" to the sciences (Coșeriu 2009: 48)
Linguistic conventions	For instance, two individuals can belong to a different social or cultural category, or to a different regional community, or they can be situated, also, in a purely "logical" convention, namely of pure symbolic "objective" and "neutral" communication, without any affective value, or in a "stylistic" convention, namely of communicating some sentiments and impulses of will, a communication exceeding the pure symbolic signification of the signs used (Coșeriu 1999: 30)
Linguistic facts	The crossing of a linguistic fact from a community to another it is due, by and large, to some eminently cultural motives (Coșeriu 1999: 61) Forming the verbs' tenses, the singular and the plural, the masculine and the feminine etc. are linguistic facts used in any type of situation, being, in this sense, independent of the generic circumstances of the speaking (the speaker, the listener, the theme, and the frame of the "discourses") (Coșeriu 2000: 14) We are, thus, in front of two important facts: a) the speakers intuit and they know certain relations existing amongst the diverse paradigms of their *language*; b) these relations can be different in different *languages* (Coșeriu 2000: 221) Regarding the grammar of his *language*, the speaker knows three categories of facts: a) he know what is what functions, namely he knows what the material expression of his *language* is made like: he knows the "morphology" or the "constitution" of his *language*; b) the speaker (intuitively) knows the nature of the diverse "constructions" of different paradigms: the what/like-s of the functioning of these constructions, namely the mode of crossing from a paradigm to another, or the mode of expressing analogue

	contents of thinking (denotative equivalences) in diverse paradigms; c) The linguistic fact itself, it must be explained in each case through function, and not through materiality; d) in order to interpret and to explain the linguistic facts the sole appropriate approach is the finalist one, and not the causal one (Coșeriu 2009: 43-44)
Linguistic geography	It is opportune to mention on this occasion that the modern linguistic geography has confirmed with the entire evidence the waves' theory (Wellentkeorie), a hypothesis already proposed in the second half of the past century by Johannes Schmidt (Die Verandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermaniscben Spracben, [Weimar], 1872), according to which the linguistic innovations (individual creations at their origin) are spread from a point of a territory, by imitation, namely through the mediation of their acceptation by an increasingly greater number of speakers, until are covered areas more or less extended, depending on the resistance and on the contrary currents which they met (Coșeriu 1999: 83)
	It is rather about a method than about an autonomous discipline. But it is a method which has been developed so amply, so that we can today consider it as an individual discipline in the ensemble of the linguistic disciplines. Truly so, the studies consecrated to the dialects, done by linguists as Ascoli in Italy and, especially, by J.Gillieron on France, they led to new ways of theoretical approach and to new conceptions (for instance, about the dialectal limits, about the spreading of the linguistic facts, about the causes of many linguistic changes etc.), to that the geographical research of the *languages* has reached the level of a new orientation in studying the *language-use*. There have been already elaborated or they are on the way to be elaborated, in the Romance *languages*, linguistic atlases of the France, of the Meridional Switzerland, of Italy, or Romania, of Catalonia etc. (Coșeriu 1999: 101)
	The linguistic geography, by substituting the punctual dialectology, it examines the relations amongst "equivalent" facts (diverse ways of materializing the same phoneme, different words for the same concept, grammatical constructions having the same function) as they occur spatially: it is no longer about establishing only "what it is said here like", on a certain point of a county, but it aims to establish the extension and its limits of what is said here and the spatial relations between this and what is said for the same thing in other areas, in the same historical *language* or, eventually, in several *languages*, a fact that can lead to important conclusions of general order (Coșeriu 2000: 61)
Linguistic history	The linguistic history will be recognized as the second discipline theoretically justified. It will have as study object the adoption and the spreading – of the objectivation as "*language*" – of the individual innovations, study which will be done from stylistic

Linguistic idealism	In the linguistic idealism, the history doesn't lose its autonomy. Even more than that, the history is one of the two basic linguistic disciplines. But it is, just because of that, the second one; the first one is the stylistics, namely and analytical discipline considered as close to the original essence of the *language-use* (…); and the linguistic history as proposed by idealism it is, actually, though in a very ample meaning, a "stylistic" history, namely motivated from the point of view of the stylistics (Coșeriu 2000: 75) The linguistic idealism, under the influence of Benedetto Croce, it has made, without any doubt, the distinction between the nature's science and the culture's sciences; but – might have been also due to the "vis theoretica" insufficiencies of its representatives – it didn't succeed to impose this point of view to other innovative currents too, which occurred during the respective epoque. Especially, Karl Vossler, the initiator of the linguistic idealism and speaker on behalf of the German idealistic school, he was a thinker with too modest speculative capacities in order to be able to make of the idealistic doctrine an organic and well founded system, appliable to the so complex problems of the *language-use*. And other idealistic linguists, maybe much more endowed for theory, they rather worked in a isolated manner, without reaching to found a school (Coșeriu 2000: 81)
Linguistic investigation	The linguistic investigation, in its quality as description and history, it is interested mainly in the technical aspect of the *language*, namely in the linguistic competence, which is perfectly comprehensible, for the technical aspect is the one presenting a greater uniformity and, consequently, it can more easily constitute the object of a science (Coșeriu 2000: 239)
Linguistic nomenclature	Everything that is linguistic tradition, it is "nomenclature" (names of tools and of tools parts, names of plants or of animals on species level etc.). These nomenclatures go beyond the linguistic competence itself, namely a type of scientific and technical knowledge, though as popular one. Actually, the nomenclatures aren't well known by all the speakers of a linguistic community, but only by some groups (not always the same ones); and, on the other hand, it is totally possible to know well a *language* and to not know, for instance, the name of a fish or the name of a flower. The average speaker is limited, usually, to a generic designation (That, is a flower, instead of that is a petunia; that is a fish instead of that is a trout) or he conforms himself to the vague knowledge when it comes about flowers and fish, by letting the specialists and the botanic researchers and the zoologists to "exactly" name those "things" (Coșeriu 2000: 254-255)
Linguistic paleontology	Applying linguistics to prehistory (Coșeriu 1999: 101)
Linguistic phenomena	The concrete linguistic phenomena are individual acts socially conditioned and determined, so that they mut obey, at least up to a

	point, to what constitutes a norm in the community which they are produced in (Coșeriu 1999: 62)
Linguistic revolutions	One could observe that the social and political revolutions often imply profound linguistic revolutions, at least regarding the vocabulary (…) It is a known fact that, also, the political *language-use* of the totalitarian governments it differs from the one of the democratic governments and that, by and large, the vocabulary reflects the nature of the society which it is used in. The common Indo-European vocabulary, for instance, it makes us thinking at a patriarchal society based on the "big family" (or on the "familial clan") and characterized by an eminently aristocratic organization (Coșeriu 1999: 66)
Linguistic sign	In this regard it is opportune to mention here the characterization of the linguistic sign, given by the Austrian scholar K. Buhler in his work *Theory of the Language-use* [Sprach theorie, Jena, 1934; translated in Spanish, Madrid, 1950]: the linguistic sign is a symptom as expression of the speaker, namely on the measure which something about the one who produces the sign it is manifested in; it is signal in relation with his listener or with his receiver, and it is symbol relatedly to its "real" signified, for it designated through a concept (or, from psychological point of view, through an "image") something belonging to a reality that is, or at least is considered as being, independent both from speaker and from listener (Coșeriu 1999: 20)
	No linguistic sign has exactly the same form and the same value (signified) to all individuals using that sign and on all moment when it is used (Coșeriu 1999: 24)
	The linguistic signs formally organize the knowledge upon reality, given the fact that they aren't purely "monstrative" (designative) elements, but they are symbolic and generalizing, namely they do not designate individuals, isolated experiences, but they signify genres, classes, or general concepts elaborated by rationality. It is an incontestable fact that even the individual entities are designated in *languages* with the help of the "universals" (respectively, the names which we refer to individuals are classes of names: we call an individual object the house, by using the names given to the respective class), and that's why, in the concrete acts of speaking, we constantly effect a logical operation, that one of implicitly affirming the inclusion of an individual into his genre. Due to this intimate connection between *language-use* and knowledge, it is obvious that we cannot make abstraction of logics in determining the *language-use*: the signs, in their quality as symbols, they are products of an activity which can be called as "logic" and they serve as instruments for another activity, also called as "logic" (Coșeriu 1999: 50)
	Rightly so, the *language-use* isn't something which integrally

	restored in each act of speaking, but it is also a traditional fact, mostly "automatized", for the cognitive operation isn't repeated in its totality on each time when somebody speaks, but the linguistic acts are created according to previous models and by analogy with resembling linguistic acts belonging to the same system (Coșeriu 1999: 50)
	The linguistic signs have significations through the mediation of which something extralinguistic is designated. This complex situation represents, at its turn, a higher semiotic level, the expression of a unit of content of superior type, namely the meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 80-81)
	Finally, the linguistic signs do not have yet any meaning. Although, just these ones, the linguistic signs, are the ones helping us to build up the meaning in texts and, on the other hand, through text we understand not only the signification and the designation of the constitutive linguistic signs, but, in the same time, something more too, something indicating beyond these elements, namely the text's meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 81)
	The linguistic sign to Buhler is it a complex sign; it is a sign from a triple perspective. To each function of the sign it corresponds a own type of sign. The sign is: "symbol, in the virtue of its subordination to object and situations, symptom (index), in the virtue of its dependence on emitter, whose interiority the sign expresses, and the sign is signal, in the virtue of its appeal towards listener, whose external or internal behavior it guides…" (Coșeriu 2013: 88)
	In the older linguistic and semiotic literature, the representation function of the linguistic sign was situated on foreground on such a measure, than we couldn't really speaking about a complex understanding of the sign. The Buhler's idea about the tripartite character of the linguistic sign it represents an innovation – at least in what concerns its detailed elaboration. In my opinion, by undertaking a critical analysis of his model, we can get closer to the problems of the meaning and, by this, we can get closer to understand the tasks of the text's linguistics (Coșeriu 2013: 88)
Linguistic sign's linearity	The speaking is developed in time and the so-called "linearity" of the linguistic sign is represented, on each time, by lines with unique sense, with a sole direction. That's why there is a permanent "psychic-physiological" conflict between the act which the signified it though through, or even the entire sign – unitary on any level, not only on the word's level, but even on the level of the phrase - and the material linearity of the expression. One could say that, what the mental content represents (signified and signifier) it is a circle that must be "undone" in a material expression (Coșeriu 2009: 334)

Linguistic sign's representation function	In the older linguistic and semiotic literature, the linguistic sign's representation function was situated in foreground in such a measure than we cannot really speak about a complex understanding of the sign. The Buhler's idea of speaking about the tripartite character of the linguistic sign it represents an innovation – at least in what regards its detailed elaboration. In my opinion, through a critical analysis of his model, we can come closer to the meaning's problems and, by this, also closer to the understanding of the tasks of the text's linguistics (Coșeriu 2013: 89)
Linguistic signs' relations	In text, the linguistic signs can be placed in relation with other linguistic signs, namely both from material perspective, and the perspective of their content. a) From material perspective. This relation type is very well known; we do not need to say here too much about it. It is about phenomena as: the rhyme, the assonance, the alliteration, and others like these. Finding a rhyme means discovering a material relation between two signs, most often, fundamentally opposed to one another, in what regards their content, and to refer to this discovery by a certain placing in text of the elements which are in that relation. b) From the perspective of the content. Here will have to be firstly mentioned the so-called "transparently-formed" words. (…) the relations with the object would be, therefore, the same on each time, but the possible associations, which can be triggered by these signs differently motivated, they would be very diverse (Coșeriu 2013: 105-106)
Linguistic taboo	The social customs have, in the same time, the effects of eliminating certain terms considered as vulgar, or too brutal, or disrespectful: it is about a certain phenomenon called, in its ampler forms, as "*language-use* interdiction")are avoided, for instance, the usual names of certain diseases, the names of certain body parts, of some physiological acts etc.), a phenomenon which, when entering the relation with fact of religious nature, with superstitions, with beliefs etc. it is more adequately called as "linguistic taboo", largely spread in the "primitive" societies, but which, partially, it is encountered in the *languages* of the civilize communities, (it constitutes, for instance, a linguistic taboo to avoid or to replace for metaphorical expressions the usual names of God, or of the devil) (Coșeriu 1999: 66)
Linguistic thinking	The linguistic thinking (and not the thinking through the mediation of the *language-use*, but the intuitive thinking which creates and which, actually, it is the *language*-use (Coșeriu 2000: 205)
Linguistic technique	The attention of the linguists has been focused until nowadays especially on the historical level of the linguistic technique, namely upon languages: the linguistics – the "modern" one not less than the "traditional one" – it has been substantially a linguistics of the languages. Or, no matter how much it is this due to some indubitable necessities or researching and teaching, it isn't legitimate to be ignored the importance of the other plans too

	(Coșeriu 2000: 239)
Linguistic typology	The linguistic typology in this sense – which, on the other hand, it is its original, authentic, and beneficial from scientific point of view – it still is at its beginnings; what is being done these days under the label of "linguistic typology" it is, most of the times, only contrastive grammar, done on the level of the systems and tautological classification of certain idiomatic procedures (Coșeriu 2000: 285)
Linguistic universals as such	They belong to the domain of the general sciences. (…) it starting point is situated "inside the language-use" and it starts from language-use and from languages as previously identified and delimited objects. (…) in what regards the formulation of the questions and the answer to them, the theory of the language-use follow the opposite direction (opposite to the general linguistics, E. l. t.'s n.): at the beginning there is situated the theory with its concepts, concepts being in a tight correlation with one another, as for instance: "language-use by and large", "individual language", "word", "sentence" etc. and often starting from these ones are then theoretically followed and deduces certain traits. The traits deduced on this way have the character of certain definitory criteria; they actually constitute – in the terminology used here – the "linguistic universal" as such (Coșeriu 2011: 40)
Linguisticity of the words' significations	Nowadays, due to researching numerous "exotic" *languages*, of the lexical and grammatical content, it has become a banality of the linguistics. And they speak all over the place about the different analysis of the reality through *languages*, about the "network of classifications which any *language* covers the reality" etc. thus than there is the tendency of starting again (and they have already started) to search for the semantic classifications and categories universally necessary, or even empirically general, more or less natural. Of course, it remains to be seen if they will become fully aware of the meaning and the importance of this "banality" and if yes, which actually will these classifications and categories will be (Coșeriu 2009: 63-64)
Linguistics	Also called as science of the *language-use*, glottology or glossology (French: linguistique or science du langage, Italian: linguistica or glottologia,German: Sprachwissenschaft) and, less properly, as philology, compared philology, compared grammar, it is the science studying from all the possible point of view the articulated human *language-use*. By and large, and in its specific forms of materialization, namely in the linguistic acts and in the systems of isoglosses which, traditionally or conventionally, are called as *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 10) The linguistics studies facts of *language*, or, rather, of *language-use* (Coșeriu 1999: 14) The linguistics as such: it would be rather the science called by Ferdinand de Saussure as semiology, namely the general science

of the signs or of all the symbolic *language-use*(s), of which the linguistics would constitute only a part. Rightly so, the linguistics, in strict sense, it occupies itself with studying that *language-use* which the "signs" are composed by sounds in, namely they belong to the articulated *language-use* (Coșeriu 1999: 15)

The linguistics researches not so much what the *language-use* is in its essence, but rather the mode which the *language-use* manifests in, in its historical forms, which are the *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 17)

We can affirm that the linguistics occupies itself only with the second type of signs, namely only with the signs having a symbolic value, or with the signs which are, though not in exclusivity, also symbols (Coșeriu 1999: 20)

The linguistics cannot be, therefore, the general science of the "*language-use*(s)" – which constitute rather the object of what is called as semiology – but it occupies itself exclusively and in the first place, with the articulated *language-use* and, secondly, with the other signs systems which only reproduce this one (Coșeriu 1999: 23)

The linguistics, in its quality as discipline having an own research method, it has appeared in the first years of the XIX Century as compared and historical linguistics, of course, without any positivist ideology, which still didn't exist as such. It was marked rather by a Romantic ideology, only partially preserved, and continued by positivism. This "autonomous" linguistics affirmed itself especially as Indo-European linguistics, in other words, as compared grammar of the Indo-European *languages*, especially of the classical *languages*, Romanic and Germanic. Around the year 1870, partially through an internal development, though not without a connection with the dominant ideology in the époque's culture and, partially, as a consequence of the influence exercised by a great German linguist, August Schleicher, it appears the school called – firstly as a joke and ironically, and then abandoning any irony – as "of the neo-grammars", namely of the "young grammaticians" (junggrammatische Schule), whose main representatives were Karl Brugmann, Berthold Delbriick, Hermann Osthoff and A. Leskien. Just the ideology of this school was that diffused, being affirmed as dominant in the university linguistics, firstly in Germany, then outside Germany. On the other hand, during the XIX Century, the linguistics – in what regarded its basic ideology – it was a science almost exclusively German, despite the fact that there were also representatives of other nations (Coșeriu 2000: 19-20)

The diversity of the conceptions determines the selection and the

	organizing of the object of the linguistics, in the global domain which is the "*language-use*", the departure point in studying this phenomenon, as also the hierarchy of the individual linguistic disciplines (Coșeriu 2000: 88)
Linguists' *language*	The linguist is interested in all the isoglosses systems which can constitute the basis of an ensemble of linguistic acts, in space and in time, and in all the isoglosses systems which some or other linguistic acts can be attributed to (Coșeriu 1999: 33)
Liquid or laterals (sounds)	The sounds called as liquid or laterals, to which, as we've seen, there is an occlusion only on a part of the palate, letting the respiratory air to flow through the other side (Coșeriu 1999: 118)
Logical syntax of the *language-use*	The dialectics, instead, abandoned as discipline in the XIX Century (we are mentioning here that even the term of thesis, applied to a doctoral work, it comes, specifically, from dialectics, from presenting a certain "thesis: in order to be defended) it has been resumed, partially, by the modern logicians, especially by R, Carnap, in what it is called as "the logical syntax of the *language-use*" (Coșeriu 2000: 15)

M	

Man	The man is a "speaking being", and even more, it is "the speaking being" (Coșeriu 2011: 73)
Mass / Liturgy	It can be though signaled as being exemplary the study of Antonio Pagliaro on the etymology of the Italian word Messa (Liturgy). In this case, the 'substantial" etymology isn't unknown, being even obvious: it is simply about the feminine passive participle of the verb "mittere", "to send", "to address". Why then the signified "Liturgy"? Well, Pagliaro notices that the etymology cannot be limited to a sole record of the development of some forms and of some signified and to a generic or abstract explanation of such a development, but it must be, on each case, reconstitution and interpretation of an original situation' of the situation which an innovation occurs in, namely when something new occurs in the form, or in the signified, and it is created and accepted as a new tradition, and which both the innovation and the acceptation can be understood and justified in. Pagliaro reconstrues, in his study, the "situation" of the Christian primitive communities and he demonstrates why, in this context, the "reference" of the formula: Ite, missa est – it could extend and it could signify "Liturgy". In this sense, of course, the etymology too, a "historical" by excellence discipline, it has a "synchronic" character. In what regards the principle of the distinction between nature and culture, consequently, between the natural sciences and the cultural sciences, we've already mentioned that it isn't either general,

	neither has a coherent employment in the present linguistics. A contrary, even if these distinctions were made as well in the linguistic idealism, and, in a less explicit manner and in the same time less coherently, in the transformational grammar too, the most part of the forms of the modern linguistics – especially, the diverse forms of the structuralism – they are maintained, in this regard, on the level of the positivist ideology, a fact that, of course, it has its effects regarding the coherent application of the other anti-positivist principles which, instead, are accepted as such (Coșeriu 2000: 78-79)
Meaning	Everything that happens in a text, everything that is described as happening, it has a "meaning", which, usually, it doesn't coincide in an unmediated manner to the described event itself, a meaning which we must, firstly, to discover. The linguistic signs composing the story of Kafka called *Metamorphosis*, they describe, through the mediation of their significations, a certain situation which, at its turn, it needs and interpretation (Coșeriu 2013: 81)
	We consider, therefore, the entire text, with its expression and with its content, as purely linguistic, as a type of vehicle for a "signification" from on another level, for the "meaning" (Coșeriu 2013: 81)
	The meaning cannot adhere in an unmediated manner to the linguistic signs themselves; in themselves, the linguistic signs do not have yet any meaning. Though, just these ones, the linguistic signs, are the one with the help of which it is built up the meaning in texts and, on the other hand, through text we do not understand only the signification and the designation of the constitutive linguistic elements, but, in the same time, also something more, namely the text's meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 83)
	Any text has a meaning, and not only the poetical and the literary texts (Coșeriu 2013: 83)
	The meaning turns out from the relations, through the mediation of which, the sign functions in the act of speaking (Coșeriu 2013: 105)
	The linguistic sign is a combination of the relations amongst signs (Coșeriu 2013: 149)
	The meaning is born out of the combination of the Buhler's functions (namely of the functions of: representation, manifestation, and calling) with the evocation (Coșeriu 2013: 150)
	The meaning is the own content of a text, namely what the text expresses beyond (or through) designation and signified. We

ascertain this stratum of the signification in the case which, inclusively in the daily life, even understanding the literal signified of some words of phrases, we ask ourselves what one intended to say with them. Consequently, we search beyond signified and designation, something that it differs from these contents; we ask ourselves, specifically, what is the: meaning: (the intention, the finality, the implications etc.) of what, under linguistic aspect, namely in accordance with the *language*'s rules and with the norms of the speaking by and large, we have already understood. A joke, for instance, beside the fact that it has a "signified" – namely, beside the fact that each word and each sentence which the joke is composed with, in has a signified – it has also an individual meaning, which will be indispensably to understand, if we want to understand the joke as such; and the "joke" (the fact that a discourse would just be a joke) constitutes, at its turn, a "meaning" (Coșeriu 2000: 247-248)

In what regards the meaning, it is justified also the special importance granted in the text's linguistics to the intimate connection between the theory of the *language-use* and the theory of the literature. Rightly so, the meaning's plan is, to say so, double-semiotic, for on this plan a signifier and a signified of *language*, they constitute a first series of relations, followed by another series, which the signified of *language* (through which the designation takes place) it becomes through, at its turn, a "signifier" for the text's content, or "meaning". The linguistic signified (and what they designate) constitutes the material part of the literary text, by being just the material part – the "signifier" – of another sign, whose "signified" it is the text's meaning. Consequently, everything that is understood in an immediate manner in a work, through the linguistic signs, it is, from the texts' point of view, only the perceiving of a "signified" (Coșeriu 2000: 248)

We want to call as *meaning* the totality of the textual functions, the totality of what one understands with the help of the text and only with the help of the text, the totality of the contents given only in their quality as text's contents (Coșeriu 2013: 79)

The term *meaning*, which we've been using it, up to now, for several times, it partially corresponds to the concept of *sensus*, similarly used, since Antiquity, especially in the translation's theory (Coșeriu 2013: 79)

The meaning is a combination of all the relations amongst signs (Coșeriu 2013: 149)

Regardless how we like to call the diverse relations occurring between the actualized sign and the its environment, these ones

	always, can only to contribute to the text's meaning, but they never can constitute the text's meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 156) Regarding the connotation, it is, like in the case of the evocation too, about a function of the sign, whilst the meaning is, though, a textual function (Coșeriu 2013: 156) The meaning is objectively given; though, there is not general procedure for discovering the meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 167)
Meaning of φύςει	In a strict sense, the expression φύσει means, rightly so, always the same thing, namely "through nature, naturally necessary"; though, it receives other meanings too, depending of the context which it appears in. In the discussion on the "right matching of the names", this term is related to the objects and the situations, and to their nature (φύσις). Who argues that the names would be "naturally necessary", that one searches from the cause of the name's apparition (causa efficiens) in the object itself. But the expression φύσει could refer both to names (words) and *language-use*. The first signs of sucha perspective can be found at Plato and Aristotle, but the two Greek thinkers do not deepen their ideas in this direction, and that's why it isn't clear what should we understand, in this context, through the "nature" (the essence) of the word (or of the *language*). Finally, φύσει can refer to the man's essence too, namely to the speaker's essence. In this mode, the discussion is being extended on another level, to proclaiming the opposition between φύσις and τέχνη (natura - ars). If this opposition is related not to the faculty of the *language-use* by and large (French: *langage*), but to the individual *language* (French: *langue*), then the hypothesis φύσει can be extrapolated – as for instance at Epicure – to explaining the differences amongst the individual *languages*; in this case, the names would correspond not to the designated objects, but to the speakers who use the names (Coșeriu 2011: 66)
Meaning's linguistics	The meaning's plan is, though everything that has been mentioned, extremely important, and it should be studied by linguists more than it is studied in reality. Sadly, at this moment, there are foreseen only the intentions, regarding a meaning's linguistics (Coșeriu 2000: 248)
Mediated verbal context	It means "farer into text", therefore, "somewhere before the sign" or "somewhere after the sign". Seen as a whole, the texts always represents thus, the mediated context for any signs which occur inside that text (Coșeriu 2013: 141)
Message (Jakobson)	The message, namely, what is communicated, the information, respectively the text (Coșeriu 2013: 88-89)
Meta-*language*	The *languages* whose plan of content becomes itself a *language*, are called as meta-*languages* (metasprog, metasemiotic) (Coșeriu 2013: 151)
Meta-*language-use*	1. Any linguistic system with the help of which it is possible to be analyzed the symbols and the structures of a *language*; 2. Meta-

language; 3. Description meta-*language-use* adapted to a formal definition of the programming *language-use*(s) (according to the French: métalangage) (www.Dex.ro)

It has as object the *language-use* itself (Coșeriu 2000: 224)

The meta-*language-use*, representing a certain use of the *language-use*, it belongs, as such, to the speaking's linguistics; in this sense it hasn't a structure and neither can be structured on the level of the idiomatic competence, for it is infinite. Actually, in the basic meta-*language-use* of the Spanish *language*, for instance, one can speak about all the world's *languages*, including the Spanish language, but also about imaginary *languages*, and we can refer – as our will – both to expressions and to whole words, and to isolated parts of those (Coșeriu 2000: 225)

Certain difficulties of the linguistic theory are due to the confusion (or non-distinction) between the primary *language-use* and the meta-*language-use*. Thus, one of the difficulties faced by the definition of the "word" – though it is rather about an apparent difficulty than about a real one – it resides in the fact that they want a circumscribing in the primary *language-use* and, in the same time, in meta-*language-use*. Or, such a thing is simply impossible, because in meta-*language-use* (inclusively in the meta-*language-use* employed together with the primary *language-use* in the current speaking) each segment of a word can reach to be a "word" (Coșeriu 2000: 256)

All the words of the "lexicon" specific to the meta-*language-use* are, that's right, substantives: the name of a letter, of a word (which in the primary *language-use* can be adjective, verb, adverb etc.), of a category – all the substantives in their quality as name of something. More than that, in meta-*language-use* entire sentences and fragments of words become to the same extent "name" and " substantives" (Coșeriu 2000: 256-257)

On the other hand, if the metalinguistic lexicon isn't structurable, by the fact that is virtual and unlimited (actually, the words of the meta-*language-use* are created at one's will, on the moment itself when they are used) the meta-*language-use*'s employment can as well to manifest a specific technique in a certain linguistic tradition, namely we can speak about a grammar of the meta-*language-use* (a grammar, in many regards, quite little studied and which should be studied) (Coșeriu 2000: 257)

Describing the *language* it refers to the primary *language-use* and not to meta-*language-use*, to the extent which the last one isn't structurable in, on the level of the "idiomatic competence". But, given the fact that the meta-*language-use* can have, even on this

	level, its own grammar, differing from that one of the primary *language-use*, when describing a *language* we should indicate either the norms of the metalinguistic use; and on the level of the grammatical analysis of the text, we should distinguish between the technique of the primary *language-use* and that one of the meta-*language-use* (Coşeriu 2000: 257-258) When the *language-use* refers to itself, namely when we speak in a *language* just about that *language*, a situation called by us as "metalinguistic use", respectively, simply, "meta-*language-use*" (Coşeriu 2013: 74) The meta-*language-use* is a *language* whose content is already a *language* (Rey Debove 1978). In this sense, any discussion about a *language* it is a meta-*language*: the definition given in dictionaries, the treaties on linguistics. The metalinguistic function (Jakobson 1963, Moeschler, Reboule 1992: 92) it allows the description with the help of the *language-use*. Saying that the verb *to wash* it is a regular verb it is an example of meta-*language-use*; Venus is disyllabic: Venus doesn't refer to the Morning Star, neither to the Evening Star, but it refer to a word which we can highlight in diverse ways (aldine letters, Italics, quotation marks), and the second part of the enunciation constitutes an example of meta-*language-use*, allowing us to speak about an element of the object-*language-use*: Venus (Lungu-Badea 2003: 71)
Meta-linguistic function	The meta-linguistic function, presupposing the capacity of the *language* of serving as code for speaking about itself, it is analyzed as a specific structure of the *language*, as a self-defining code. From this point of view, using the *language* in meta-linguistic it isn't parallel to the other functions, but it is mostly tied to the informative function (Nida 2004: 65)
Metatext	Result of a complex, deep analysis, of the text, by applying to it a criticist demarche, a hypothesis upon that text (www.Dex.ro)
Metrics	The whole metrics, as also other procedures belonging to symmetrically structuring of the text on the plan of the material expression, shortly, all the phenomena gathered in the ancient rhetoric under the name of numerus, they fulfill in poetry – I am exaggerating here a little, but only a little – the same function the frame of a painting fulfills it. Numerus isn't else but the effort for delimitate through an explicit and visible methods the poetry from the practical speaking, as they would say: "What you hear here, what is written here, it claims to be interpreted as poetry". To the poetry itself, though, the numerus isn't lacking the importance (Coşeriu 2013: 94)
Minimum effort	(cause of the linguistic change, E. l. t.'s n.) According to the theory of the minimum effort, certain sounds or phonic groups of "difficile" pronunciation, especially the consonants groups, would be transformed and simplified, by being reduced to groups with a more "facile" pronunciation or to unique sounds. (…) It has been

	noticed that, by and large, the intervocalic unvoiced consonants "tend" to be transformed in sonorous and then in fricatives, because the sonorous have a more "facile" pronunciation than the unvoiced (they require less muscular effort) (Coșeriu 1999: 85)
Mistakes' grammar	Today exists a discipline, though not sufficiently developed, which essentially has this objective: it is the so-called grammar of the mistakes, which can constitute an important source for the historical grammar. It is called as the grammar of the "errors" given that fact that each novelty, each aberrant linguistic fact recorder in a certain *language* it constitutes an "error" from the point of view of the previous system considered as norm; but these so-called "mistakes" (or at least many of them) are the ones which, by spreading out, they are accepted as new norms and they reach constituting the regulate elements of the system which themselves have modified (Coșeriu 1999: 73-74) I've said that the errors' grammar can constitute an important source for the historical grammar. Rightly so, by recording the new and still not generalized linguistic acts)"erroneous" from the point of view of the norm valid at the time), we have the possibility to verify, during a period of time, if these ones have been imposed as new norms or, rather, which of those acts have been imposed and which, instead, have been rejected by the "use", namely we can notice, in a certain measure, the *language*'s becoming (Coșeriu 2013: 74)
Momentary sounds	The momentary sounds are articulated on a single moment and it cannot be infinitely prolonged (Coșeriu 1999: 112)
Morpheme	The morpheme it opposes to semanteme (or to lexeme) (…), being "morpheme" those ones having only an instrumental signified, namely those ones functioning as modifier and grammatical or lexical determinators. Amongst words "morphemes" are: the desinences, the prefixes, the infixes, the suffixes and, eventually, the accent, the alternances, and even the absence of a material determination (the "zero" morpheme), whether this indicates a certain function (Coșeriu 2000: 102) The "morphemes are, by and large, all the non-analyzable (undividable) linguistic forms at their turn in other linguistic forms, namely all the "simple" words (…) a complication appears here due to the fact that, through morpheme, especially in the North-America structuralism, they understand only the functional unity of a linguistic form. Thus, the Italian: ii, Io, V (form of the masculine article as singular) would be in the traditional terminology different "morphemes", while to the North-American structuralism, these ones represent three variants ("allomorph") of a sole morpheme. The things get even more complicated if there are distinguished morphemes, morphs, and allomorphs (Coșeriu 2000: 103)

	In glossematics, instead, are called as morphemes exclusively the grammatical determinators (not also the lexical modifiers which are called as derivatives) and only as functions, namely in their quality as "content" facts (Coșeriu 2000: 103)
Musical pitch / tone	The frequency itself determines the sound's pitch, or what linguistically is called as tone (Coșeriu 1999: 104)

N	

Names designating the essence of the objects	The *language-use* provides also pre-formed objects of another type, "objects" which cannot be formulated in problems in the same was as we do with the trees, the fish, or the bridges (…). Expressions like: art, technique, truth, virtues, history, science, or *language-use*, they refer to the essence of the objects which they designate (Coșeriu 2011: 36-37)
National *language*	By affirming itself as such, usually, the common *language* it is differentiated from the dialect which it has come from, often removing from that dialect the too local characteristics, and it becomes a true national *language*, above all dialects, which, through its prestige, it succeeds in completely removing those dialects (Coșeriu 1999: 37) Sometimes, out of a unique "linguistic" *language*, namely out of a unique dialectal system, there appear several common or national *languages*, and some other times, to several dialectal systems, it corresponds them a common unique *language* (Coșeriu 1999: 38)
Natural genre	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000: 216)
Naturalness in the semantic domain	The really essential problem, referring to the "naturalness" in the semantic domain, it indicates the problem of the relation: " nature" – *language-use* (or "world" – *language-use*). In order to determine the "natural" or "non-natural" delimitations, one will proceed as the "nature" or the "world" would be an dimension independent of the *language-use*, a fact appearing as being already delimited in the *language-use*, having, as well, existing autonomous classifications for itself, "things" classes already delimited in their existence, which the *languages* should only designate and whose limits the *languages* should pay attention to (Coșeriu 2009: 66)
Neo-grammars	In order to understand - in its dialectical roots – the linguistics from the beginning of the XX Century up to these days, we must interpret it as an assertive reaction against a certain ideology, namely that one of the neo-grammars (Junggrammatiker), which is not else but the form achieved in linguistics by the evolutionist and positivist theory in linguistics. That's why, we won't be surprised by the fact that the reactions against the ideology of the "neo-grammars" are contemporary to other reactions manifested

	in parallel, in other domains of the culture, especially in philosophy (Coșeriu 2000: 17)
Neo-linguistics - of Mateo Bartoli	It almost doesn't have anything to do with the structuralism. In this case is about a form of applying the linguistic geography to history. Namely, we owe to Bartoli the enunciation of the four "spatial norms" (norme areali) – referring to the distribution of the linguistic facts on a geographic area – through which certain synchronic (actual) data are interpreted as indices of the historical succession take in consideration. According to one of these norms, that one called as "of the lateral areas", if in a linguistic space that was previously continuous, some forms occur in marginal areas and other, equivalent from functional point of view, they occupy the central zone; the forms of the marginal zones ("lateral areas") are, usually, the oldest ones, representing a previous "stratum", unsubstituted for the innovations diffused from the center of that linguistic territory. Namely, out of synchrony it is deduced the diachrony, out of a "circumstance", a history fact (Coșeriu 2000: 75)
Neutrality	The neutrality is methodologically important, on order to describe the *languages*. For the "intensive" terms have, each of them, a sole *language* value*,* we owe to start any concrete research with that these ones: in their case it will be easier to reduce the "acceptations" to unitary signified. In other words, we must start by asking ourselves which the terms of "concentrated" value are,, which aren't usually employed instead of other terms, and which terms are really used as such: the first ones will be the most "intensive" ones, and the last ones will be the "extensive" ones. But after we have established the values of the intensive terms, it will be the case to determine, related to these, the ampler and more complex values of the "extensive" terms. An "extensive" term, having two values in *language*, it presents, by definition, a greater variety of uses, a variety, at a first glance, which, one cannot distinguish any order in: sometimes this term is the opposite of another terms, while some other times it coincides and it can be replaced for that term. The "imprecision" increases when is about a neutral term, not about a sole opposition, but about several oppositions, and this is a quite frequent case. Thus, it would be not only a difficult but even a desperate undertaking, rigorously speaking, and impossible one, that one of claiming to delimitate in a positive sense the value of the "present" in Spanish, because of succeeding only to establish that the "present" is "everything' and it cannot be distinguished from the other verbs tenses. Actually, there aren't practical uses which the present to remain excluded from (in other words, case which not to be possible to use the present in, "instead of " other verbs tenses), and in the most part of the contexts specific to it, the present remains outside the temporal perspectives and it doesn't opposed to any verb tense particularly. Instead, its position in the verbs system and its variety of uses will be entirely clarified if one notices that it is about the neutral term

	Neutralizationof many temporal oppositions (Coșeriu 2000: 205-206)
Neutralization	The neutralization has theoretical importance for understanding the *language-use* by and large, and for understanding the *languages*, for it unveils a specific logics of the *language-use*, differing from the properly-said logics and from the sciences' logics. In logics, in sciences, and in the scientific *language-use*(s), it is valid the principle of the contradiction, and due to this the oppositions amongst the same-level terms have the following form: |A/non-A |. In other words, a thing is either "A" or it is "non-A" and it cannot be in the same time both "A" and "non-A". Instead, in the linguistic thinking (not in the thinking through *language-use*, but in the intuitive thinking which creates and which, actually, it is the *language-use*) it isn't valid this principle, so that: "non-A" it equally can be "A", though not inversely ("A" cannot be also "non-A") (Coșeriu 2000: 205)
	The material neutralizations take place in certain position and phonic contexts, for instance: in final position, in initial position, in atonic position etc. For the content neutralizations one can speak also about "contexts"; but in this case it isn't about phonic contexts, but it is about the circumstances which a signs is employed in, and which comprise: the semantic context, the extralinguistic situations, and the speaker's signifier intention. This means that the neutralizations cannot be explained in a general mode, but only in each *language* individually; rightly so, aren't acceptable in this sense the explanations done through "physiological reasons" or through the claimed universals of the *language-use* referring to the expressions' plan. The so-called physiological reasons do not automatically annul functional distinctions; and the material neutralizations aren't the same in all *languages*, and not even in the *languages* belonging to the same family (Coșeriu 2000: 210)
	The content neutralizations take place, fundamentally, in three cases: a) when the distinction is considered as superfluous because it is redundant (namely for it is already given in another mode: by situation or by context); b) when one doesn't want to or he cannot specify it; c) when the fact which it refers to it corresponds to the neutral or to the generic value (Coșeriu 2000: 210)
	The neutralization is the suspension, in certain contexts, of a functional position existing in the *language*, on one of the language's two plans: either in expression or in content (Coșeriu 2000: 212)
	The neutralization refers directly to oppositions, these ones being "homogenous" by definition, namely belonging to the same plan: they are material or content's distinctions, and they cannot be in

	the same time "of expression and of content" (Coșeriu 2000: 214)
	Non-mediated verbal context "Non-mediate" means here "in the immediate neighborhood of the sign" (Coșeriu 2013: 141)
Non-person	Emile Benveniste in his studies upon the category of *person*, he argues that grammatical persons are only the first person and the second person, whilst the third person, in reality, it is a "non-person". Rightly so, the first and the second persons are the ones who participate to a dialogue, being, in this sense, effectively "persons", while the third person, or better said, that one called as the "third person", by being the persons whom it is being spoken about, it isn't necessarily a person, but it can be anything: an object, a happening, an abstract idea; actually, it corresponds to "the rest of the world". Or, a similar interpretation of the grammatical persons is offered us by Harris (…) He noticed in a footnote that there exist only two persons, the first person and the second person, while the third person isn't but the "denial" of the first two persons (Harris reiterated, on the other hand, a thesis of Apollonius Discolus) (Coșeriu 2000: 13)
Non-speaking	The non-speaking means, at some adult normal and conscious human beings, to be silent, namely to have-ceased-speaking, or to not-be-speaking-yet; it is, consequently, a negative determination of the speaking, as delimitation of as suspension of the speaking (Coșeriu 2009: 36)
Normative grammar	The normative grammar, instead, it is the grammar elaborated for didactical finalities, which signals a "model" of *language*, by classifying the forms and the constructions in "correct" and "incorrect". In other words, the descriptive grammar only ascertains what something is said like, while the normative grammar signals what should something be said like, in conformity with diverse "correctness criteria" (in reality: types of idiomatic exemplarity) (Coșeriu 1999: 99)

O

Object-*language-use* / primary *language-use*	We can speak about things in a certain *language*. We call this as primary employing of the *language-use*, the object-*language-use* (I personally prefer the term of primary *language-use*) (Coșeriu 2013: 99)
Onomasiology	Discipline studying the designations starting from concepts or from the designated "things" (Coșeriu 1999: 100) The onomasiology, which is being developed in parallel with the linguistic geography, it considers the words relatedly to the designated things (Coșeriu 2000: 61)
Onomastics	The study, usually historical, of the proper names (Coșeriu 1999:

	100)
Open syllables	Are called as open syllables the syllables ending in a vowel (sonant) (Coșeriu 1999: 125)
Organon model as developed by Jakobson	Besides the "classical" elements of the model – at Jakobson" emitter, recipient, and context (namely "context" not in the usual acceptation, but with the sense of "speaking's referring point", "the thing which they speak about", and therefore "objects and circumstances" in Bühler's terminology -, at Jakobson in the middle of the scheme it appears – and this is already more than a terminological differentiation – the message, therefore: what is communicated, the information, respectively the text. As supplementary element, in this broad scheme it appears the environment within which there is conveyed information, the contact environment having the role of making possible to the emitter and to the recipient to enter the communication. This contact channel is, of course, especially important when it doesn't take place a direct communication, when the discussion partners communicate with one another rather indirectly, through written texts, on the phone etc. Finally, there appears, of course, the "*language*" too, in other words the key which the emitter and the recipient have in common, - or, at least, which both of them should have in common equally -, in order to cypher and to decipher the message. Correlating himself with the theory of the communication, Jakobson calls this element as code (Coșeriu 2013: 88-89)
Oriented linearity of the things' time; Oriented linearity of the speaking	The image – that reproduces the facts – it remains image even inversed; but the word isn't image: it is a sign or, excepting the special cases, it is another sign and, thus, it represents at its turn the direction characteristic to any sign of this kind. So, by speaking about this, we cannot avoid the oriented linearity of the speaking (Coșeriu 2009: 351)
Oscillograph	The modern experimental phonetics uses much more complicated instruments and of a greater precision, as there is the oscillograph, which "takes pictures" of the waves, in other words, it transforms the acoustic waver in luminous waves (Coșeriu 1999: 103-104)

P	

Paradigm	Any unitary class of functions and/or forms within which it is operated an immediate paradigmatic selection, it is a paradigm (Coșeriu 2000: 141)

The paradigm mustn't be considered as class of everything that can be presented in the same "context", namely, in the same "void" position of a syntagm (Coșeriu 2000: 142) |

| | A paradigm is constituted of the present term and the terms which its presence excludes immediately (Coșeriu 2000: 143)

The totality of the flexional forms of a word; table of the forms of a word, given as model for the flexion of a speaking part of a class from the frame of a speaking part (www.Dex.ro)

1. (at Plato) the world of the ideas, prototype of the sensitive world which we live in; principle distinguishing the fundamental connections and oppositions amongst a few dominant notions which have a command and control role upon thinking; exemplary case, model, prototype, ideal situation
2. the totality of the flexional forms of a word; ensemble of terms belonging to the same morphosyntactic or semantic class, which can be substituted one for another (www.Dex.ro) |
|---|---|
| Paradigmatic axis | Or of the selection, it corresponds to the classes of functional and material units of a *language* from amongst which it is chosen the entity adequate to what it is intended to be expressed (Coșeriu 2000: 140)

The paradigmatic axis, (…), it must be imagines as a line that moves along the syntagmatic line and which is valid to any "position" of this one, which a selection is operation on (Coșeriu 2000: 140)

The paradigmatic axis, it is "disjunctive" or "exclusive" ("either x or y" or " if x then not y" and vice versa), because a relation between a present (selected) element and others absent ("unselected" or "excluded") elements of the same class of *language*'s units (Coșeriu 2000: 140) |
| Paradigmatic structure | The paradigmatic structure is the structure (the "form of the internal relations" or the "composition") of the units (or "members") of a paradigm of any type (lexical or grammatical) and of any level, being given by the relations amongst what these units have in common and what differentiates them from one another; the structure of each paradigm being the resultant of the positive relations amongst the units constituting it (Coșeriu 2000: 147)

The paradigmatic material structure is the differential structure of the signifiers expressing the functions of a semantic paradigm. In grammar, - except the case of lexical suppletion and the cases which the functions are expresses through alternances in, or through accent, tone, and intonation (but in a certain sense, in these cases too) – the content differences are manifested as material differences on the syntagmatic line, so that the respective paradigms are paradigms of syntagms (Coșeriu 2000: 147-148) |
| Paradigms of genre and number | The genre and its number belong to the paradigms of genre and number characteristic to the Romanian *language* (Coșeriu 2000: |

	141)
Para-grammatical functions	Namely analogue to those from grammar ("forming the words") (Coșeriu 2000: 148)
Parallax from *language*	1. Angle which a certain front is seen under, at a certain distance; angle between two straight line touching the center of a star, one line starting from the Earth's center and the other one starting from observation point 2. error when reading the measuring instruments with indicator needle, when the observer doesn't watch perpendicularly on the apparatus's scale (www.Dex.ro) Technical term signifying, amongst others, the apparent changing of an object's position, caused by the changing of the observer's position (Nida 2004: 166)
Paremiology	The paremiology or the science about proverbs (Coșeriu 2000: 261)
Performative function of the *language*	When the *language-use* accomplishes a performative function, the source aims to change the state of an object or of a relation. Using the language in order to bless or to curse, it has a clearly performative role. Officially declaring that a person is married or divorced, it represents a situation of employing the performative *language-use* (Nida 2004: 64) The performative function presupposes the attempt of influencing the receptors' status, for instance, by pronouncing a marriage, by condemning a criminal, by cursing an enemy, of by blessing a benefactor. In the most cases the performative function employs of a strongly ritualized *language-use*, and just this fixed and authoritarian formulation is that conferring to the performative *language-use* power and prestige (Nida 2004: 162)
Phatic	Phatic function is a function (determined by Roman Jakobson) had by the words uttered in a dialogue in order to establish or to maintain the connection between the communication partners (www.Dex.ro) Phatic refers to the purely external character of the language, of maintaining the characters' dialogue without transmitting anything (www.Dex.ro)
Phatic function	Regarding the contact channel, Jakobson identified a function which he called by using a term of the anthropologist Malinowski: phatic function. It is about the function of a simple contact making, about the "channel's verification", on the purpose of establishing if there are the physic-technical conditions or the psychic mood for communication (Coșeriu 2013: 90) In the first place, a few words on phatic function. Jakobson would want that this function to refer to any act of speaking, and not only to the communication done with the help of the technical means.

	Understood such, the so-called "phatic" function isn't except the minimal form of the calling or of the appeal function. Aa minim requirement addressed to the message's recipient, it somehow implies the availability of receiving and of interpreting the succession of signs (…). This type of imperativeness is present in any act of speaking – the appeal function includes, thus, the so-called "phatic" function (Coșeriu 2013: 99)

The *language*'s phatic function is more frequent than one believes. It rather serves to bring people close to one another than to modify their behavior, their emotions, or their state. Many phone calls amongst friends are phatic in the first place, by signaling especially the persons' desire of being in contact and not necessarily to convey information. When somebody answers the phone, every five minutes, by saying yes, uhm etc. it doesn't means that he agrees what is being said to him. It is about a phatic use of the *language*, indicating that he is still on the line (Nida 20034: 65) |
Phenomena of syntactic phonetics	Namely of inter-adaptation of the sounds within phase, having a great importance in the phonetic system of certain *languages*, as the Portuguese language, where the final phonemes of the word very often adapt they concretization to the initial phonemes of the following words (Coșeriu 1999: 26)
Philologist	The philologist is preoccupied, usually, with a sole *language*; the philologist usually occupied himself with texts having a certain oldness and bringing certain information ; the philologist doesn't occupy himself with the individual linguistic sciences (phonetics, grammar, semantics etc.) (Coșeriu 1999: 13-14)
Philology	In strict sense, through philology we understand today, the criticism of the texts and – in an ampler sense – the science of all the information deduced out of texts, especially out of the old texts, information referring to the life, the culture, the social relations, the familial relations, the economic relations, the political relations, and the religious relations etc. of the environment which the texts themselves were written in, or of the environment which the texts refer to. In other words, while the linguist by and large considers the texts only as linguistic facts, as *language-use* phenomenon, the philologue is interested in the texts as culture and history documents. In this sense, the philology is science auxiliary to history and to literary history, and sometimes it will coincide to the last one, especially if we take in consideration a literary history that would ignore the aesthetic criterion, or that it would occupy itself with texts lacking any literary value. But the philology is a science auxiliary to linguistics too, for it provides this one with all those data which cannot be exclusively deduced out of the linguistic aspect of the texts, but which, instead, they are indispensable to the exact interpretation of this aspect (Coșeriu 1999: 13)

	The philology, even based on texts which can present also linguistic interest, it occupies itself, by and large, with history facts, especially of old history, especially of social and cultural (literary) history (Coșeriu 1999: 14)
Philology	Discipline studying the written culture of the peoples, especially the old texts and the literary works from the *language* point of view, of the influences suffered, of the model which they have been transmitted to us in, and of their authenticity, as also of their wording (www.Dex.ro)
Phonation	Producing the sounds (Coșeriu 1999: 110)
Phonematics	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000: 151, 156))
Phoneme	The basic unit of the phonology it isn't only the sound, but it is the element that, in two or more equivalent sounds from two or more equivalent linguistic cats, it can be considered as identical from functional point of view: and it is called phoneme (Coșeriu 1999: 94) The type-sound (Metea 2003: 121)
Phonemic	Referring to phoneme (www.Dex.ro)
Phonetic change	(the speaker, E. l. t.'s n.) can give (to a sign, E. l. t.'s n.) a phonic content differing from that one normally had in community (Coșeriu 1999: 57)
Phonetic continuums	As acoustic phenomenon, the *language-use* it appears under the form of some continuous sequences of sounds, or phonetic continuums, separated through intervals (Coșeriu 1999: 103)
Phonetic laws	To the positivist linguistic it is characteristic the idea of "phonetic law", according to which the phonetic developments ascertained between two or more successive state of the same *language* are necessarily general, regulated and without exception. (…) Such regulates correspondences which can be attributed, according to the positivist linguistics, to the action of some causes similar to the one from nature, are confirmed by the "phonetic laws", which offer the scientific satisfaction of having discovered that in *languages* too there takes place something analogue to what is observed in nature, this being equivalent to demonstrating the fact that it exists an internal lawfulness of the *languages*, one revealed just by these "laws", even when the so-called "causes" of the development aren't known. From here they cross to an even more ambitious aspiration: the desire of foreseeing future developments, for this would be a maturity proof for any science (Coșeriu 2000: 33)

Phonetics	Branch of the linguistics studying the producing, the transmission, the hearing, and the evolution of the sounds of the articulated language. General phonetics is a branch of the phonetics studying the sounds by and large, without focusing on a certain *language*. Descriptive phonetics (or static) is a branch of the phonetics occupying itself with the description and with the classification of the speaking's sounds by and large, or of a certain *language* in a determined period of time. Historical (evolutive) phonetics is the branch of the phonetics studying the sounds of a *language* or of a group of *languages* kindred in their development, trying to establish the laws which the phonetic modifications take place according to. Experimental (or instrumental) phonetics is a branch of the phonetic studying the articulated sounds with the help of some special apparatus and technical means. Syntactical phonetics means the study of the phonetic modifications suffered by a word under the influence of the neighboring words which that word is in syntactic relations with. Functional phonetics = phonology (www.Dex.ro)

The phonetics is a branch of the linguistics studying the speaking's sounds, namely the sounds of the articulated *language-use* specific to the man, by following the acoustic structure of the sounds, the mode which they are bornin, they combine in, and they are modified in (Metea 2003: 12)

We distinguish, on one hand, a science of the sounds from "parole" (speaking), occupying itself with the acoustic and physiological aspects of the sounds: this is the science which was given the name as phonetics, and which is understood as study of the real and concrete sounds from the linguistic acts. An branch of this discipline is the so-called experimental phonetics or, rather, instrumental phonetics (Coșeriu 1999: 94)

The fundamental task of the phonetics, in its quality as science of the sounds „in speaking", it is that of describing, as exactly as possible, the sounds corresponding to a *language* (the diverse acoustic concretizations of that *language*'s phonemes, in their multiple combinations. It is a task which won't present insolvable difficulties, if we examine the "living" *languages*, which can be submitted to the direct and instrumental research, But this kind of research it proves to be more difficult when it comes about *languages* which ceased to be spoken, or about linguistic acts which we know only in the form recorded in writing (Coșeriu 1999: 126) |
| Phonic painting (onomatope) | In what concerns this object it has been objected on all ways, being said that neither in the case of the so-called "onomatopoeic" words the principle of *arbitraire du designe* wouldn't really be transgressed. (…) It is, therefore, obvious that, in case of his |

	type of "painting", we speak about an extremely stylizing manner, owed to the tradition of each historical *language*, and by no means about a naturalistic imitation. All of these things are correct, but, understood as objection, they do not touch the problem itself. It is decisive, once more, what these onomatopoeic element signify to the speaker and not the objective evaluation of the imitative relation, under the report of the "fidelity of reproduction" of the respective objects. To the speaker, the respective words are onomatopoeic, and to a certain degree they are even identified to the natural sound which they reproduce. It is therefore about signs which are icastic by their finality, signs having as express purpose, if not that of faithfully reproducing, through their substance, the natural sounds, at least to evoke them (Coșeriu 2013: 125)
Phonic units	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000: 90, 210)
Phonological awareness	We have a "phonological awareness", namely we distinguish the phonemes, given that from purely physical point of view, there is no continuity between the sounds of a phonic group (Coșeriu 1999: 103)
Phonological (distinctive) value	The three mentioned qualities can have in a language a phonological (distinct) value or, eventually, only a stylistic value: they will have a phonological value if their variation can distinguish the signs, namely if it can imply a variation of signified in the enunciative language-use; they will have a stylistic value if they can constitute the manifestation of an emotive attitude of the speaker (Coșeriu 1999: 106)
Phonological School from Prague	The Phonological School from Prague admits the signified as study object and as criterion for delimiting the facts from expression, by considering the language as "form" and "substance" in the same time. Consequently, in the phonology of Prague type, the phonemes are identified through functional criteria, with the help of the "commutation": in a signifier it is substituted a sound for another, in order to check if by this the respective signified is changed or not. If the signified doesn't change, the two sound belong to the same phoneme, and if it changes, in a few concrete cases, it is about different phonemes (Coșeriu 2000: 98)
	The "School" appeared and developed in relation with the Linguistic Circle from Prague, created in the year 1926 by V. Mathesius, but amongst its representative are scholars from other centers from Czechoslovakia (of those times) and from other countries. Let's mention here: B. Havrânek, B. Trnka, J. Mukafovsky (researched in the domain of aesthetics and poetical language-use), V. Skalicka (founder of the new linguistic typology), J. Vachek; and the Russian researchers: N.S. Trubetzkoy (since 1922 professor in Vienna), S. Karcevskij (since 1928 professor in Geneva) and R. Jakobson (who arrived in Czechoslovakia in the year 1922 and between the years 1933-1939

he was a professor in Brno). Jakobson and Trubetzkoy were the ones imprinting to this School a phonological and structuralist orientation. We've already mentioned that it is only partially a Saussurian school. Rightly so, it appeared and developed in the first years on different bases. Mathesius, already in the year 1991, he made the distinction between synchrony and diachrony (distinction coming, on the other hand, in the Czech tradition, form the philosopher T. G. Masaryk, which established it in the year 1885), and in its works on the "characterology of the things" he mainly refers to Humboldt, whom he considered a being the founder of the "static" linguistics. On the other hand, despite not being about its sole domain of activity, the school concentrated upon "phonology" as science of the "language sounds" (opposed to "phonetics", a science of the sounds from "speaking" or considered as material facts), namely upon a domain that was, in the Saussure's vision considered as marginal and even external to the language's system. Just in this domain, the School from Prague affirms, contrary to a thesis belonging to Saussure, not only the "systematic" character, but also the "teleological" or "finalist" sense of the linguistic change (another idea coming from Masaryk), and so the possibility of applying the structuralist approach to the domain of the language's development too. Likewise, the theoreticians of the phonology, Jakobson and Trubetzkoy, they rather related themselves to B. de Courtenay than to Saussure, despite the fact that no one of them had been direct disciple of Baudouin. The Saussurian orientation itself, it was represented, probably, at the beginning, by S. Karcevskij, who studied in Geneva. But this orientation doesn't seem that it was important during the first years. Actually, the report presented by Jakobson Karcevskij and Trubetzkoy, at the first international congress of the linguists in Hague (1928) – the official act of birth of the central-European structuralism, later called as the "manifesto of the phonology" – it started, really, with the Saussure's thesis on language as "system of relational values", but in the same time the respective report explicitly criticized the Saussurian conception on linguistic change as being fortuitous and "agrammatical", being affirmed, instead, the teleology of the phonic changes, and also the unit of the synchrony and diachrony. And Trubetzkoy, who, through the Fundamental of Phonology reached to be the real founder of this linguistic discipline, he presented in his first work on the domain a "psychologist" phonology, by constantly referring to Lautvorstellun-gen ("phonic" or "acoustic" representations) in the sense given by B. de Courtenay. Only later on, especially under the influence of Buhler, he adopted as basis the distinction "language" / "speaking" in Saussurian form, by considering the phonemes in an objective functional sense. What happened, consequently, it was a progressive getting closer to Saussurian-ism. The School of Prague is characterized by the fact that it takes in account both the

	expression's plan and the content's plan, both the "form" and the "substance" of the linguistic units, insisting since the beginning upon the possibility of a diachronic structuralism, whose first concrete models were offered by R. Jakobson (Coșeriu 2000: 110-112)
Phonology	On the other hand, we distinguish a science of the sounds in "langue" (*language*) – the phonology – which studies the sounds as functional entities or as element accomplishing a linguistic function (of constituting and of differentiating the signs) and not as purely material phenomena (Coșeriu 1999: 94) The structural discipline that has reached, under all aspects, the highest degree of development it is the phonology (Coșeriu 2000: 156) Unlike the phonetics, the phonology is a discipline which the sounds can have several variants in, and which studies the phonemes (the type-sounds), namely those sonorous units having the function to differentiate the sounds from one another (Metea 2003: 12) A branch of the linguistics occupying itself with the study of the *language*'s sounds from the point of view of their functional value, by establishing the system of phonemes of an idiom and the character of diverse variants; functional phonetics (www.Dex.ro)
Plerematic (pleremic)	Formal semantic study (Coșeriu 2000: 90)
Pleremes	The content units will be considered in glossematics independently from their "semantic substance", in other words, as purely formal units (…) and they will be analyzed in traits lacking the "descriptive designation") namely: non-named, traits which will can be explicitly named only when reporting these units to their substance, namely by crossing from plerematic to pleremic (Coșeriu 2000: 90)
Poetic function of the *language*	The poetic functions, as discussed by Jakobson, it implies rhetoric micro and macro levels (Nida 2004: 162)
Poetica *language* / poetic text	It isn't correct to say that the poetic *language* or the poetic text, they necessarily deviate from the "normal" *language*, form the "normal" text (Coșeriu 2013: 84)
Polyglots' *language*	The polyglot practically knows a determined system of isoglosses belonging to a certain historical moment (Coșeriu 1999: 33)
Polyonomy	If one and the same object can receive several names, which one of these names will express the essence of the respective object? (Coșeriu 2011: 69)
Polysemy	The polysemy, contrary to what it is usually believed, it doesn't imply in the facts themselves "imprecise or indeterminable signified", but, on each case – as it should have been clear since Aristotle -, "two or more unitary signified which can be attributed

	to a sole form" (Coșeriu 2000: 174-176)
Popular *language*	Dialectal (Coșeriu 2000: 264)
Positivism's principles	The "positivism" as ideology and as methodology of the sciences, it is fundamentally characterized by four principles: a) the principle of the individual or of the individual fact (a principle which, from the view point of the successive reaction against the positivism, it will be called as the principle of the "atomism", aiming but this to highlight and to disapprove in the same time the interest for the particular isolated facts, detached from their relations and contexts); b) the principle of the substance; c) the principle of the evolutionism; d) the principle of the naturalism. These principles have a fundamental importance for our objective, for the present linguistics opposes to each of them – or, at least to the first three ones – diametrically opposed principles (Coșeriu 2000: 21-22)
Pragmatics	Amongst logicians, it occupies more or less the same place as the ancient rhetoric, the so-called "pragmatics", or the *language-use* study from the point of view of the relations amongst the *language-use*'s users, namely from the point of view of using the *language-use* in the practical life (Coșeriu 2000: 15)
Prague School's grammar	The grammar inspired from the principles of the School from Prague, at their turn, the ignore the "relations", but they approach with an equal interest the "constitutional" and the functional aspects of the *languages*; these are, at least, their intentions, because until now there hasn't been written any complete grammar in conformity with the principles of this school and, by and large, the Prague type of structuralism it has occupied itself very little with the superior grammar's levels (the sentence's syntax and the phrase's syntax) (Coșeriu 2000: 229)
Predicable	What can be applied to a subject; what can be predicated, preached; universal notion (genre, species etc.) (www.Dex.ro)
Predication	Through διαίρεσις ("separation", "analysis") we must understand an operation which, without being purely linguistic, it takes place in the *language*'s environment, an operation which a property of the object – as, for instance, the property of being "green" of the "object" tree – it is formally separated through, and then it is counterposed to the tree. The synthesis (σύνθεσις, "joining") it is the operation which the formally separated property from the object, it is again attributed to the object through, with the help of the "is": The tree is green (Coșeriu 2011: 122)
Pre-linguistic	The things as objects of the representation as such are surely "pre-linguistic", by existing independently from the *language*. A contrary, the things seen as being *these* or *those things* (as "animals", "trees", "forests" etc.), namely as examples for "quiddities" (scholastic term for "essences", E. l. t.'s n.) and, by and large, as objects of thinking, they are expressed just through *language-use* (Coșeriu 2009: 67)
Primary *language-use*	It has as object extralinguistic realities (Coșeriu 2000: 88)

Primary lexicon	Including the pronominal elements (Coșeriu 2000: 148)
Principle of systematicity (structuralist)	The principle of the systematicity (or of the systematic structuring) it refers to the mode of existence of the analogically functional units series, in the diverse "subsystems" of a *language*, representing in this sense a rational and empirically justified supposition. According to this principle, in a linguistic system, the functional differences appear – usually, or frequently – "systematically": they are presented for a series of analogue units. Namely, the same distinctive traits are usually employed in several oppositions of a subsystem, so that these ones are presented as symmetrical or "proportional" (A/B – C/D – E/F etc.); and this, at its turn, it implies the fact that through the same distinctive traits, combined differently, there are structured units in a number superior to the number of used traits. It is, consequently, about some kind of functional "economy". In itself, a system will be "economical" if it uses at maximum the distinctive traits which that system integrates; and, from several systems, the most "economical" will be that one having a smaller number of traits and structuring the bigger number possible of oppositions, namely of units (Coșeriu 2000: 196)
Principle of the „situation"	Or of the "static essence" – which opposes to the principle of the evolutionism and of the correlative evaluation of the description relatedly to the modes of genetic and historic approach -, it has as correspondent in linguistics the opposition between synchrony and diachrony, or between description and history and the affirmation – explicit or implicit – of the primate of the synchronic aspect upon the diachronic aspect and, consequently, of the primate of the description upon history. The consequence of this fact is that of not affirming only the own value and the autonomy of the description, but, in comparison to the previous epoque, it is inversed the correlation between description and history: either one does exclusively description, or he firstly does description and then history, making the history dependent to description. Instead of starting from "evolution" in order to explain the states, one starts from states in order to explain the "evolution" and, to say so, instead of "fundamental descriptions on historical principles", it is presented the history as "founded on synchronic principles" (Coșeriu 2000: 74)
Principle of the culture	To the principle of the naturalism it opposes, in anti-positivism, the principle of the culture or, more exactly, the distinction between the natural objects and the cultural objects, namely between the nature's science and the culture's sciences. In other words, the nature's sciences are no longer accepted as model of the sciences by and large, because of being considered that these ones, just in order to exist as such, they must differ according to their research object (Coșeriu 2000: 50)
Principle of the	It means that the facts, of better said, the classes of facts

evolutionism	(conceived as new "individuals", of superior order) are analyzed in their "evolution" or as phases of an evolution, eventually predetermined. Thus, after creating the abstraction called "literary genre", it is supposed that the genre present a certain evolutive cycle. Symptomatic, in this sense, it is the case of the French critic Brunetiere, according to whom the literary genre would be born, would develop, and would die, like the natural organisms. In the same time, they consider that the evolution (or only the evolution) can explain and justify the "essence" of the facts. So, for instance, the art is interpreted as an evolved form of the play, of the word, or of some manifestations ascertained in the communities called as "primitive", or even in the animal environment (Coșeriu 2000: 24)
Principle of the form	To the principle of the substance it opposes, in the anti-positivist ideology, in the first place, the principle of the function and, secondly, the principle of the form; often, "function" and "form" being identified to one another or, at least, being treated together. In conformity with this, they consider – especially where it is about life and activity and, so, about acting "organs", and "objects" used for something ("instruments") – that the essence of these "facts" and "objects" is manifested in (and it actually coincides to) what they do, namely, by using a Heidegger's formula: "the essence of the hammer is manifested in the fact of the hammering". Consequently, in the anti-positivist research, the facts are being identified and delimited through their function, and not through their substance. Facts differing as substance (for instance, in literature, in art, in the techniques, and in the folk traditions etc.) they will be interpreted as being unique – as being "the same fact" – if they fulfill the same function and, inversely, identical fact in their substance, they will be considered as different if they fulfill different functions, and that, actually, it often coincides to the "original knowledge" of these facts, as manifested in *languages* too, in the name given to certain types of objects (let's think, for instance, at the substantial variety of the functional unit called in Spanish as puente (English: bridge). Even in the nature's sciences it is affirmed the idea of the functional relations and of the different functional contexts, despite their eventual "substantial" identify (Coșeriu 2000: 45-46)
Principle of the function	It is also, practically general, the acceptation of the principle of the function: almost without exception the linguistic units are defined and are identified through their function, and not through their substance. It is true that, often, they trye to distinguish between the "objective" nature of the linguistic units and what the units "do", and their "why" (Coșeriu 2000: 78)
Principle of the functionality (structuralist)	The principle of the functionality refers to the constitutive fact of the *languages*, based on the postulate of the solidarity between the two sides of the linguistic sign and, consequently, between the two plans of t *languages* as systems of signs concretized in speaking: the plan of the expression or of the signifier (the material plan of

the *language-use*) and the plan of the content or of the signified (the purely mental plan). This principle can be reduced to the formula: "in a *language* there are constitutive the idiomatically functional facts of that *language*" (or "in a *language* are constitutive only those facts which that *language* itself delimitates through the mediation of the differences on the two plans of its signs"). This formulation, at its turn, it can be made explicit in the following mode: a certain material difference will represent a "*language* fact" if it is functional in the respective *language*, namely, if there will be corresponding to it differences of signified too; and a difference in content will represents a fact of *language* if in the same *language* correspond to it also specific differences in the material expression. Regarding the differential elements of the expression and of the content, this principle is valid, especially, as negative norm (important mainly for comparing different *languages*): a material difference (even a constant one) it doesn't have to be considered as a fact of *language* in a strict sense, but a "fact of speaking" (or of "*language*'s materialization), if it never implies difference of signified. And a semantic difference thought or intuited as such, it will have to be considered as *language* fact (distinction characteristic to the *language* or to the *languages* in discussion) if to this one it doesn't correspond any specific expression. Concerning the *language* units, the principle of the functionality is valid in a positive sense: the units of a *language* exist as functional facts of that *language*. Thus, a phoneme will exist as such, if at least in certain cases it distinguishes signifiers with different signified. A unity with two plans, (expression and content) in grammar and in lexicon is, as *language* unit, an invariant of expression united with a variant of content. This is valid for each unit of this type, considered in all its uses in speaking: in order to be the same *language* unit, it is necessary that a certain form to correspond to an individual content, characteristic to the *language*, and vice versa. It isn't necessary, instead, that in *language*, the same forms to explain in all the units the same signified; as it isn't necessary either that a unit of signified to be expressed in all the units of the two plans through the same form: the relation between expression and content it is constants inside the same unit in its diverse employments, but it isn't necessarily "regulated" in all the units of a *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 161-162)

By applying the principle of the functionality it is established a hierarchy of the facts: it is distinguished the functional plan of the *language* – the plan of the functional units – from the plan of the variants of concretization. These ones can be mandatory, as in the cases of forming the plural in English and of the singular masculine article in Italian, in the majority of the contexts, or facultative, as in some concretizations of the same article in Italian (Coșeriu 2000: 164)

	The principle of the functionality is based on the postulate of the solidarity between the plan of the expression and the plan of the content: a series of variants will represent a functional unit if it corresponds to them the same signified, and a series of variants of the content will represent a functional unit (a signified) if it corresponds to them the same expression. This thing must be strictly interpreted as a condition of the existence of the functional units of form and of content, and of their delimitation relatedly to their variants, but not as infallible criterion for differentiating on each case on the both plans in the same time, because the correspondence between forms and contents, considered in the whole *language*, it also can not to be as one to one. Rightly so, it is known that there are identical forms whom correspond two (or several) signified (case of "homophony") and unique signified whom corresponds two (or several) forms as such, namely, undetermined as variants through the phonic contexts ("synonyms") (Coșeriu 2000: 170) The methodological or technical corollary of the principle of the functionality is, as we've said, the commutation (Coșeriu 2000: 182)
Principle of the individual fact	The principle of the individual fact or of the scientific "atomism", it means that the researcher's attention is focused upon each individual fact and that the universality is considered as being the result of an abstraction and generalization operation, starting from a great number of individual facts. Consequently, there isn't recognized any kind or universality or generality of the fact before the operation, through which – by ascertaining the analogue or identical traits of a series of facts and then by generalizing (through induction) what has been effectively experimented – it is being built up an abstraction, a generic scheme of the "class" of facts take in consideration (Coșeriu 200022)
Principle of the naturalism	It presupposes, in the first place, that all the facts can be reduced to the natural facts: it is what we've ascertained regarding the literary genres and it is what we are going to ascertain, in continuation, regarding to the *languages* too. Consequently, it is estimated that all the facts – equally the ones belonging to the human sphere, as the art and the *language-use* – they are submitted to the principle of the causality and to the principle of the necessity in the nature's world. Namely, the cultural facts are considered as being natural facts, as they will take place due to some "causes", and as they would be governed by laws of the necessity. The methodological corollary of this principle it is that the nature's sciences are taken as model for sciences by and large, and to the cultural facts are being applied "naturalist" modes of approach and methods. That's why, are being researched the causes of the facts and the laws of their "evolution", namely a lawfulness of natural type; this desiderate being satisfied only once the laws are discovered – especially the laws of the

213

	development – which determine and regulate the facts (Coșeriu 2000: 24)
Principle of the neutrality (structuralist)	The principle of the neutrality, which, as we've told, it is specific to the "European" structuralism, it introduces an important restriction on what regards the functioning of the distinctive oppositions in a *language*, by establishing that these ones do not function in all the cases which the respective unit occur in, because in certain context and/or situations they remain (or they can remain) suspended or "neutralized" (Coșeriu 2000: 198) And the "neutralization" isn't but using the neutral term for the neutral value, for what corresponds to the entire functional zone of an opposition. So it is explained the fact that the other term – "characterized" or "positive" – it doesn't occur in the neutralizations cases; rightly so, that term corresponds only to a section of this "functional zone" and it cannot, consequently, represent this zone in its integrity (Coșeriu 2000: 201)
Principle of the opposition (structuralist)	The principle of the opposition refers to the manifestation of the functionality in the *language* units; in other words, this principle regards the units' nature and their "identity" (the fact that they are these ones or those ones) and, it can be summarized in the following formula: "the functional units exist (as such) due to the "oppositions" which they participate to". There is "opposition" (or "direct opposition") amongst units which, being identical in the rest, they function as different units through the mediation of a minimum differential element (non-analyzable later in differential elements). So that one can say that a unit A will exist as such in a *language*, in expression or in content, if that unit if in opposition with other unit or units: if in the same *language* there is at least a unit B which, being distinguished from A through a functional element, it "opposes" unit A as another unit (Coșeriu 2000: 189) We've affirmed that, in the opposition between two units, one of the differential traits can also be "zero". This means that, in this case, what distinguishes the two units it is, rigorously speaking, the positive trait specific to one of them, whilst the unit presenting the "zero" trait it doesn't have specific characteristics, being characterized, inside the opposition, only through the absence of the positive trait belonging to the other unit. In other terms, the unit characterized through "zero" it corresponds only to the common part of the two units, whilst the other is this common part and something more (its differential trait). Just in this sense can be interpreted several of the case which we've spoken about. (…) the unit that, in an opposition of this type, it presents the differential positive trait (a distinctive "mark") it is called as "characterized term (or member)", or "marked"; and the unit that is distinguished only by the fact that it doesn't present this trait, it is called as "uncharacterized" or "unmarked" term. By the fact that exists in itself a positive mark, the characterized unit is equally called as "positive term", so that the other unit, distinguished negatively, it

	will be called as "negative term". In addition to that, the unit presenting the "zero" trait, for it corresponds to the common aspect of the two units in opposition and for it isn't the contrary of the other one, it is also called as the "neutral term". In conformity with this last fact, we can present, spatially, an opposition between a "neutral" term and a "positive" term as being constituted within a functional zone (delimited from other units), which a section presents an own additional mark in (Coșeriu 2000: 201-202)
Principle of the potential suspension	It is the general principle which we've referred to, firstly in connection with the three levels of the linguisticity, namely the principle of the potential suspension of the more general levels by a more special level, that can be later determined. Thus, what isn't congruent it can be, eventually, admissible when there is a linguistic tradition that allows, through specific rules, a transgression of the congruence or even expressly requires this transgression of the congruence (Coșeriu 2013: 72)
Principle of the situation	Or of the static essentiality, which implies as corollary the revaluing of the description in opposition to the genetical approaches and to the historical studies. It is remarked, rightly so, that the essence of the "facts" must manifest on each moment of their becoming, because otherwise it won't be about the same facts, and in order to establish the things' "what(s)", simply, it isn't necessary to resort to their origin and development, because it is about something that ought to be possible to be ascertained in any of their "states". On the other hand, for the necessary condition for capturing the essential traits of a fact it is the traits' permanence, one can notice that the genetic and the historical studies cannot establish them, because of not even put the problem of these traits and that actually, these studies imply previously, the knowledge of the permanent essence of the things. Thus, one ascertains that it isn't possible to explain the art as such, neither to establish what the art is, by studying its origins (Coșeriu 2000: 48)
Principle of the substance	It has in sight that each fact is considered through what is "is", namely as "substance" and, being about a material fact, inclusively through what it "is" to the physical experience, and not through what it "does", neither through the purpose which it "is done" on, namely not from the point of view of its function or of its finality. Thus, in order to refer ourselves once more to the literature's study, the so-called "literary genres", also conceives as classes, they aren't considered according to the functions which the respective works can have (because a "novel", for instance, it could have a function analogue to a "poem"), but according to their "substance", namely, in accord with certain aspects ascertainable in what the respective works themselves represent to the immediate experience (as there would be: prose, verses, narration, description, number of characters, "facts" which they speak about etc.) (Coșeriu 2000: 23)
Principle of the system of facts	In the second meaning – the "atomist" one – the principle of the individual fact is substituted for the principle of the facts systems,

	of the context, and of the structure, a principle intimately connected to that of the universality of the individual, but which, though, it refers to other aspects of the mode of presenting the "individual facts". According to this principle, a fact gains its full meaning and it is this fact and not another, not as an isolated fact, but only within an ampler structure, inside a system or relations which it belong to. More than that, in the psychology of the "form" or of the "structure" (German: Gestaltpsychologie) it is noticed the fact that even the perceiving of the objects is presented within a structure and that the objects isolated from their contexts prove to be unrecognizable, like, often, we won't identity a person who we though know, if we meet him outside hie usual environment (Coșeriu 2000: 40-41)
Principle of the transformations	The coherent applying of the principle of the transformations, which the generative-transformational grammar tries to demonstrate through, that the phenomenon is very ample (and it doesn't present only a practical interest). More than that, it is demonstrated that, effectively, several facts belonging to different paradigms, they establish a certain reciprocal relation, being interpreted in this mode by the speakers themselves – who know that some facts are primary, and others are derived – as "transformation" of the first ones (Coșeriu 2000: 220)
Principle of the universality of the individual	This is one of the fundamental principles of the Husserl's phenomenology, in whose vision no "individual" is only and exclusively individual, but it contains and it manifests its own universality (Coșeriu 2000: 37)
Principles of the analytical structuralism	The fundamental principles of the analytical structuralism, which – though not exposed explicitly, as such – can be deduced out of the theses argued by the theoreticians of this current, and out of the experience of the structural research, they are the following four ones: a) the principle of the functionality with an important corollary referring to the signified – that one of the unitary signified – and, with a methodological corollary, or the technical corollary of the commutation; b) the principle of the opposition having as methodological corollary the analysis if distinctive traits; c) the principle of the systematicity (or of the systemic structuring); d) the principle of the neutrality. The first three principles characterize the structuralism by and large; the forth principle is specific to the European structuralism and, despite representing the consequence of the first three principles, it isn't accepted by the North-America structuralism (Coșeriu 2000: 160)
Problem of the *language-use* autonomy	This problem is put both under objective aspect and under subjective aspect. Does the *language-use* represents a human autonomous activity, or it derives from other human activities? If we deny the *language-use*'s autonomy, we will have to ask ourselves out of which activity the *language-use* must be deduced, from amongst the accepted or generally recognized activities. Is it the *language-use* mainly a practical, instrumental activity, or is it a theoretical one? And if we grant the *language-use* a place amongst

	the theoretical activities, we will have to ask ourselves, furthermore, if the *language-use* belong to poetry or to logics, to the intuitive thinking of to the rational thinking. If, on the other hand, we accept that the *language-use* is autonomous, we will have to ask ourselves which the place the *language-use* occupies it is, amongst the other practical and theoretical activities of the man (Coșeriu 2011: 45)
Proclitic and enclitic	But the phonetic groups themselves can contain autonomous words, form phonetic point of view, having their own accent, and element without an own accent, called as proclitic and enclitic. As they "elan against" the beginning of the end of the autonomous word (Coșeriu 1999: 107)
Propaedeutics	Preparing education comprising the basic element of a science (www.Dex.ro)
Proper names	And the individual designations historically established – "the proper names" – are, in this concern, a secondary phenomenon presupposing the understanding of the universal (there are proper names only for entities already name through appellatives and not inversely) (Coșeriu 2009: 48)

The proper names (nomina propria) designate, by definition, individuals, objects of the history. Everything that carries a name and it "cannot be framed in a notion" – it is linguistically identified as an individual, and we can ask ourselves regarding his history (Coșeriu 2011: 35) |
| Purely enunciative or purely emotional convention | The *languages*, at their turn, they present internal differentiations from stylistic point of view, namely form the point of view of the purely "enunciative" or purely emotional convention which the signs are produced in (Coșeriu 1999: 92) |

Q	

Qualities of the sounds of the *language-use*	The sounds of the *language-use* presents well known qualities of any other sound studied by acoustic, namely: intensity, pitch, and duration (Coșeriu 1999: 103)

R	

Rational opposition	Of what one can expect. It isn't affirmed that the oppositions must, but that, usually, they present themselves in this mode, though in phonetic and in grammar this constitutes the (a phenomenon) "normal". Consequently, in our concrete research (of an unknown *language*, for instance) it is correct to constantly bear in mind this possibility, and its materialization cannot be

	questioned: if the repetition of some oppositions is effectively manifested or not, it must be established in each *language* and in each individual case, because it also may not occur (Coșeriu 2000: 197)
References to cultural traditions	The references to certain cultural traditions, frequent and "usual" – though non-mandatory – in the speaking of each community. For instance, the references to a certain mythology are characteristic to the Greek and Latin cultures, so that in order to adequateiu understand the Greek and the Latin texts, it is often indispensable to know those mythologies. It is true that these aspects are "philological" first of all, and they refer to texts which are typical to certain cultures but, partially, these ones are characteristic to certain texts in certain languages and, in the last analysis, they are facts referring to the use of those *languages* (Coșeriu 2000: 242)
Referential function (Jakobson)	And what Buhler calls as representation (Darstellung) it appears in the Jakobson's scheme as referential function (Coșeriu 2013: 90)
Region	Through region we understand the space within the limits of which a sign functions in certain semantic systems. The limits of this space are given, on one hand, by the tradition of the speaking and, on the other hand, by the knowledge which the speakers have about the signified situations. From here results a another subclassification of the frame of region in: zone, domain, environment [German: Zone, Bereich, Umgebung; Spanish: zona, ámbito, ambiente]. (Coșeriu 2013: 133)
Relation amongst: designation – signification – meaning	Amongst designation, signification, and meaning, there is the following relations: the designation and the signification, namely what the linguistic signs name and what they signify only through a certain *language*, they compose in text – taken together – the expression of the content unit of a superior type, more complex, namely just the expression of the meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 80)
Relation between *language-use* and religion	Finally, another social relation which we must signal here, it is that between *language* and religion. Being, in this case, about two forms of the culture, one can say that the unique possible relation is that of "cultural collaboration", of reciprocal interferences and influences between the *language* and the religion of the same community. We've already mentioned the "*language-use* interdictions" due to the beliefs or to other motived of religious nature; and, by and large, one can affirm that the appurtenance of a linguistic community to a religious community it implies the existence of certain terms in that community's vocabulary and, sometimes, even the existence of certain phonemes (Trubetzkoy quoted the case of the Russian ecclesiastical environment, which the "g" is pronounced in, not like occlusive but as fricative), as also the presence of certain syntactic constructions etc. (Coșeriu 1999: 70-71) There are, as well, relations which cannot be ignored between the religion organized as institution and the forming of the common

and literary *languages*, as also between religion and the preservation of some *languages*, grace to their liturgical use. The most part of the older linguistic documents available to us, regarding the peoples called as "primitive", we owe it to the missionaries who studied the respective *languages* on the purpose of the religious propaganda, *languages* which they often ended up using them in writing referring to religion too. Thus, the continuity of the Quechua *language* as culture *language* it is due, at least partially, to the fact that the Catholic missionaries used this idiom as "lingua franca" in their evangelizing activity, and they even elevated it at the rank of liturgical *language*. Also, many of the old *languages* which we know, they have been used as "liturgical" *languages*, namely as *languages* used by religious communities or in sacred rituals (Coșeriu 1999: 71)

The Sanskrit, a such important *language* in the Indo-European linguistics and which has revealed to us several genetic relations amongst the Indo-European *languages*, it was at its origins the literal *language* of the sacerdotal class from India, namely not a popular *language*, but an "occult" one, and especially of religious culture. Likewise, our knowledge on Gothic, we owe them to the Bible's translation, done by the Goth Bishop Ulfilas; what we call the paleo-Slavonic or the ecclesiastical old Slavonic (German: Altkirchenslavisch) it is, at origins, a dialect of the old Bulgarian used by Cyril and Methodius for evangelizing a part of the Slavs, and that had been transformed in some kind of religious koine of the Slavs belonging to the Oriental Church; the Avestic is the language from Avesta, namely the sacred text of the Zoroastrian religion; the Umbrian, namely the *language* of an ancient people from Italy, we know is mainly from the so-called Tabulae Iguvinae, which contain the text of a sacred ritual. The preservation of several *languages*, it is due exclusively to the fact that they were *languages* of some religious communities; so it is the case of the Coptic, coming from the old Egyptian, which has been maintained as liturgical *language* of that part of the Egyptian people which adopted the Christian religion. Other *languages*, also, they owe their prestige, in the first place, to some reasons regarding the religion: thus, the Arabic was spread in a great part of Africa and Asia just through the Islamic religion. Even a *language* from the Occidental Europe as the German *language*, it owes much to some reasons of the same nature" rightly so, the literary German *language* and common today – the modern "German *language*" – it is at its origins the *language* used that Luther for translating the Bible (Coșeriu 1999: 71-72)

Pagliaro rebuilds, in its study, the "situation" of the primitive

	Christian communities and he demonstrates why, in this context, the "reference" of the formula: Ite, missa est, it could extend and it could signify "Liturgy". In this sense, of course, the etymology too, as "historical" discipline by excellence, it has a synchronic character (Coșeriu 2000: 79) Certain types of repeated discourse (beside the facts related to the respective literatures) are characteristic to certain communities and, consequently, they should be taken in account, especially when describing and teaching the linguistic traditions. To the Spanish linguistic community, for instance, are characteristic the so-called "proverbs". Instead, in the Italian linguistic community, it is typical to repeat some beginning fragments from lyrical works, as "un bel di vedermo", "che gelida manina", "la dona e mobile", "ii cavallo scapita", formulas known and presently used by the ones who know the literary works which the mentioned formulas belong to. In the Protestant communities (in England, Germany, Sweden, The United States of America) there was spreading the knowledge of the Bible, being frequent today the allusions to this text; this thing couldn't have happened in the Catholic communities, which the knowing of the Bible is almost null, so that such allusions would have been most of the time partially or totally incomprehensible. And in the ancient Greek community, at least on a certain cultural level, there were constant allusions to Mythology and to Homer (Coșeriu 2000: 261)
Relation between linguistic sign and system of signs	On what measure a linguistic sign from a certain *language* it is in a relation with a whole signs system or, in the case we want to examine here, in relation with a "historical *language*"? A relatively detailed debate on this regard we find in the writing of the Danish linguist and theoretician Louis Hjelmslev. Hjelmslev started from the idea that each linguistic sign function under two aspects. Firstly, the sign functions in the direction of the reality which must be designated, in the direction of the designated objects and situations, in the direction of the denotated. On the other hand, Hjelmslev considers, though, that each linguistic sign refers, as well, to the signs system which it belong to. The first mentioned aspect of the functioning of a linguistic sign it was called by Hjelmslev as denotation, while the second one was called connotation (Coșeriu 2013: 110-111)
Relation between science *language-use*	The relation between science and *language-use* is, therefore, the relation of a secondary and conditioned fact, with a primary and conditioned fact. But this relation must be interpreted in its proper meaning. The "things", as something known and delimited, they are accessible only through the mediation of the *language-use*; but a technique knowledge regarding the things it is possible also without *language-use*: the animals have too, up to a, point, a knowledge of this type. What isn't possible without *language-use* it is the science: ἐπιστήμη; and this isn't only for it is more practical and comfortable the use of a word instead of a thing,

	namely the word tiger instead of the actual tiger, neither for the things' science should investigate only linguistic facts. A contrary, the sciences claim – and rightly so – and they must occupy themselves with the things as such, beyond the *language-use*. The *language-use* is presupposed by sciences in the sense that only through the mediation of the *language-use* it can be declared the "what" of a certain thing and because only regarding to what is linguistically given it is possible the question regarding the things' "what"(s). (…) any other science crosses beyond *language-use* in two essential sense: on one hand, it heads towards the reality of the things themselves and, also, of the things which are not given in the *language-use* (which the science discovers on its own, or it delimits with the help of its own criteria); on the other hand, the science undertakes a special designation of the *language-use* as technical *language-use*, both for what is already given in the *language-use* and for what it discovers or it delimited by itself. Only that, in both senses, the science founds in the *language-use* its basis and starting point. (The technical *language-use*(s) have their models too, in what is in the linguistic traditions ("*languages*") the technical *language-use*, namely nomenclature or terminology, and this means, actually, a manifestation of a "science", even if of a popular science) (Coșeriu 2009: 50)
Relations – associative	F. de Saussure made the distinction between (…) the "associative relations", or in absentia, the relations between a sign though and concretized and other signs of the same *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 138)

Obviously, int his form the concept of "associative relation" it doesn't refer to the structure of the *languages*, or of the idiomatic facts; in a *language* as such there aren't "associations": there is material and semantical resemblance and diversity of the signs. The associations, instead, are established (or not), on each case, by the speakers, in their own mind or, as Saussure said, in their "memory", these relations being possible to be established in any order and on any direction (Saussure himself spoke in this regard about a fortuitous "constellation"). Namely, the associations would be facts of "speaking", though motivated through *language*. But, by being about free associations, this last thing isn't necessary: bally added, rightly so, the associations motivated through the real contexts of the designated "things" and through the ideas, the beliefs, and the activities referring to "things" (Coșeriu 2000: 138)

Rigorously speaking, it isn't even necessary to limit ourselves to one *language*, neither to *languages*, for nothing impedes the speaker to associate signs belonging to diverse *languages* and to different expression systems,. Consequently, the associative relations, in their ensemble, the cannot be delimited either in *languages* nor with the help of the means of the descriptive |

linguistics corresponding to them. Even if they could be delimited, they wouldn't tell anything about the objective structure of a *language*, neither about the position of an individual fact in a section or another of the *language*, because, despite appearances,, it is about an "atomist" notion: the associative relations aren't reciprocal determination amongst the facts belonging to a system, but only "external" connections established starting from an individual fact. Rightly so, any fact can be taken as center of an associative network and the associative relations can continue endlessly, to the last limits of the respective domain (Coșeriu 2000: 138-139)

In the actual linguistics (excepting a part of the Saussurian "Orthodox" linguistics(, the Saussurian concept of "associative relation" has been abandoned, being preserved out of it only what effectively refers to the idiomatic structures (Coșeriu 2000: 139)

Relations paradigmatic –	Amongst the members of a paradigm (which, at its turn, can be "member' of a superior order paradigm) there is a paradigmatic or oppositive relation (Coșeriu 2000: 141)
	The paradigmatic relation isn't a syntagmatic relation in absentia (between a context as what could be presented in a void position of this context), but it is the relations between a term selected for a certain designation and the class of possibilities of the *language* which this term is selected within (Coșeriu 2000: 143)
Relations syntagmatic –	F. de Saussure distinguished between "syntagmatic" relations, or in praesentia – relations amongst the signs present in a "syntagm" (unit of linguistic expression, for instance, a sentence of a locution) (Coșeriu 2000: 138)
	It is maintained intact the concept of "syntagmatic relation". Better said, it is considered that the functions of the *language*, in concretizing that *language* in speaking, are reciprocally determined through the relations which they establish on two axis: the "semantic axis", or the axis of combining and ordering, which corresponds to the signs' succession in the "chain of speaking:, and the "paradigmatic axis" or of the selection, corresponding to the functional and material classes of units of a spoken *language* out of which it is chosen the adequate entity for what is intended to be expressed (Coșeriu 2000: 140)
	Amongst the members of a syntagm (which can be, at their turn, syntagms) there is a relation (Coșeriu 2000: 141)
	The syntagmatic relation isn't a simple "adding" or a material combination. By and large, it represents, on all cases, a "rection", in a way, and of "determination" in another: a unit "requires" another, and the last unit "determines" the first unit, which depends on; consequently, the functional syntagmatic structure

	isn't identical to the combinatory structure, which is as its "expression" (Coșeriu 2000: 149)
Relations between (linguistic) signs and "things	It is about the icastic function of the sign, about directly imitating the designated thing through the signifier of each sign individually, respectively, through the significations of a signs chain; finally, it is about the relation between the material signs, namely the vehicles of the signs, and the designated things. In its fundamental lines, this collection of problems it is very well known from the dialogue Cratylus of Plato. Since early, it has been made a distinction between forms of this direct representative function of the sign; proposals of classification in the domain were made especially during the XVIII Century. The modern linguistics, with some exceptions, it considered this domain as marginal, and it even tried expressly to minimize its importance (Coșeriu 2013: 123-124)
Relations between (linguistic) signs and the "knowledge of the things"	In the previous subchapter we have occupied ourselves with the relations between the signs and the objects or the situations, which the signs designate. But this isn't the sole type of "objective" relations, respectively "extralinguistic" or "extratextual" which we will have to take in account if we want to follow to its end the question we have put just from the beginning, regarding their apparition, in building up the meaning in texts. The signs function within text not only on the basis of the direct relations with the "things" (relations which, also, we have discussed), but also on the basis of the relations instituted between signs and our knowledge about the designated things, on the basis of the relations between signs and the knowledge which the users of the signs have about the designated object. It goes without saying, that through "things" we refer, on all cases, to the physical objects (Coșeriu 2013: 132) The signs are in a relation with the knowledge of the things designated by them and, by this, with an entire culture (Coșeriu 1999: 135)
Relations with groups / categories of signs (of the linguistic signs)	Here could be framed the example of the Italian word pipistrellor: "bat". Rigorously, by its possibility of being motivated, this word is in relation not with a sole sign, but with an entire category of signs, with the diminutives. But let's try other examples too, of this type. Here would fit, for instance, the relat5ion between the grammatical genre of a word and the natural genre, the sex of the designated living being. As linguists, we know that this relation is mostly arbitrary (Coșeriu 2013: 108)
Relations with the signs from other texts (of the linguistic signs)	The relations of this type aren't established between a sign actualized in a text and other signs, categories of signs, or system of unactualized signs, in absentia, but they appear between the sign from the text and the signs from other texts. Of course, it isn't about any kind of texts, but it is about texts having a history, texts belonging to the linguistic and cultural tradition belonging to a community. In principle, we could speak, in this sense, about isolated signs, for instance about an isolated word, which has been

	used only for once in a certain text, in a specified manner. Usually, it will be, though, about sequences of signs, about "readymade" combinations of signs, which are transmitted as such, as a whole. One can distinguish here two subcategories: on one hand, we have in sight everything that it transmitted within a linguistic tradition as fixed locution, namely: expressions, proverbs, and so on, the pure reproduction of what has already been said; I call this as repeated discourse. On the other hand, it can be about texts, literary and non-literary, which have ended up to be so well known within a community, than we can suppose that several members of the linguistic community they have a knowledge, partially literary, of these texts. We are referring here to the so-called "sayings" (Coșeriu 2013: 120)
Relations with the whole system of signs (of the linguistic signs)	Another subgroup inside the category which we are speaking about here, it is represented by the relations subsisting between a linguistic sign and the entire signs system. Through "signs system" we must understand both the historical *language* and the "functional" language. To these two terms - which I could explain in their entirety only in the context of my whole linguistic theory - I resort only on the measure they appear to me as absolutely necessary for understanding what is following. So, through "historical *language*" we understand what one usually understands, in our times, through a certain *language*, namely a technique of the speaking, already historically identified as such, recognized as such by its speakers and by the speakers of other *languages* and which, normally, it is named with a proper name, respectively with an adjectivum proprium: das Deutche: the German *language* etc. On what measure a linguistic sign from a certain *language* is in relation with an entire signs system or, in the case which we want to examine here, in relation with a "historical *language*"? A relatively detailed debate on this matter we find it in the writings of the Danish linguist and theoretician Louis Hjelmslev (Coșeriu 2013: 110-111)
Repeated discourse	A concrete discourse can often be analogue to a painting done, partially, as a collage; in that painting, besides portions executed with the painter's technique, there also can be portions takes from other paintings, painted by other painters. The repeated discourse can be a quotation: repetition of some texts fragments – literary or others – known as such. (…) The common trait of these forms is that their elements of cannot be linguistically "structured", because, on the measure they are fixed, they aren't interchangeable ("commutable"); consequently, they do not participate in actual functional oppositions. On the other hand, the repeated discourse can be submitted to some construction rules which ceased to be actual, and it can contain unidentifiable forms (…) or it can simply belong to other languages (…). Certain types of repeated discourse (beside the fact related to the respective literatures) they are characteristic to some communities and, consequently, they should be taken in account especially when

	describing and teaching the linguistic traditions (Coșeriu 2000: 260-261)
	But how can we include the repeated discourse in the structural and functional description, if the discourse elements, as it has been mentioned, they cannot be "structured" and, consequently, they escape a structural consideration? It is true that the main object of the structural description it is constituted the free technique' although, we must notice that, if the elements of the repeated discourse, elements analogue to the elements of the free technique ("words, grammatical instruments) aren't commutable in their specific domain, their combinations, instead, namely the units of the repeated discourse, they functionally correspond to units of diverse levels of the free technique, and they are commutable with those ones, and therefore they can be considered as "non-analyzable" units of the same technique, on the levels of grammatical structuring which they function on. Form this point of view, some forms of the repeated discourse do not belong by any means to the idiomatic technique, because of not being equivalent to combinatory element of this one: these are the forms corresponding to entire texts (or to some text fragments with complete meaning), as there are the quotations and the proverbs. In this case there cannot be oppositions inside the idiomatic technique, but only between a text and another text; it is, in reality, about forms of the "literature" (in a broad sense, namely also morals, ideology etc.), of literary traditions inserted in the linguistic tradition, and which should be studied by the text's linguistics and by philology. Truly, a philological discipline, the paremiology, or the science about proverbs, it partially occupies itself with these aspects. But there are forms belonging to the same type and which should be studies more than they really are (Coșeriu 2000: 261)
	Other forms of the repeated discourse functionally corresponding to some "syntagms" (combinations of words) of the free technique, by being commutable (by opposing to) other syntagms, they should be studied, consequently, on the syntagmatic level (Coșeriu 2000: 263)
	It is here about the possibility of using the signs in texts in such a mode than to be understood as allusion to an already and established sequence of signs (Coșeriu 2013: 121)
Report between description / history	Regarding the report between description and history, there isn't' a general agreement, because the linguistic history still isn't enough cultivated and, in addition to that, it is conceived and interpreted in way too different meanings. But there are at least premised for an agreement, the main premise being the recognition of the so-called primacy of the "situation" also for history, namely of the fact that to the history it is attributed, in a

	way, a "synchronic" character; rightly-so, this fact can be interpreted as an adequate and authentic mode of understanding the history in its specificity. Consequently, one will understand in the same time that isn't about our synchrony, but it is about the synchrony of the historical facts taken in consideration. In this sense, the history not only that "depends" on description but it even necessarily implied the description, because of interpreting a historical fact it specifically means rebuilding it mentally, in its own contexts, and considering it and understanding it in its synchrony. In the more recent linguistic history there aren't many examples of this procedure (Coșeriu 2000: 78)
Report between word-object	This problem can be formulated in an ontological sense: Does the word (in its quality of onoma: signifier) correspond actually to the being of the object which it names? Neither the affirmative nor the positive answer to this question changes at all anything of the problem's meaning. Then, the problem can be formulated from logical-functional perspective: What is the purpose the word exists on? What one reaches like, from articulated sound to name? What is the connection between the object designated by name and what is said about that object? Finally, the question can be oriented in the direction of the name's origin and thus it becomes a problem of glottogonic nature. What we have come like, to the fact that some objects are invested with the respective names? What the origins, of the words and of the *language-use* by and large, are? During this period they had in sight, de facto, mainly the ontological aspects of the problem. The logical-functional aspect was, for several times, sketched by Plato, but it was explicitly discussed only by Aristotle. Finally, the glottogonic aspect represented the central point of the discussion in the philosophy from after Aristotle, and it appeared, in similar formulations, in the later philosophy of the *language-use*, until Leibniz (Coșeriu 2011: 64)

It results that the problem of the report between word and object can be discusses in a sense related to the aspects approached above, and which, though, they move the center of interest from epistemology to the sign's theory: the report between word and object must be considered as "natural" (necessary, motivated), or "non-necessary" ("unmotivated by nature", based on convention of arbitrary)? (Coșeriu 2011: 64)

Inside the report between word (*language-use*) and object (the extralinguistic reality), a report treated by Plato in an undifferentiated manner, Aristotle identified three relations: a) the purely linguistic relation (inherent to the *language*) between sound and signification (the words' form and content, respectively, the relation between signifier and signified); b) the relation of ontological nature between name (word) and object "the extralinguistic reality); c) the logical relation between subject and |

	predicate, understood here as the report between an object represented by a "name", about which it is said something, and what is said about that object through a verb (ῥῆμα) (Coșeriu 2011: 106)
Reports of reciprocity between *language-use* and time	In the first place, the *language-use*, as a real fact, it is sunk in time: as any other fact of the reality, it takes place (and it unfolds) in time. Secondly, the *language-use* signifies and it represents the time and its structure, as intuitively conceived, and not less structuring the entire human experience and the "whole" world as object possible to be thought, a world built up, of even created by man with the help of the *language-use*. Thirdly, the *language-use* names the "type of the things", namely it places and it orders the thing and the events in time. To these reports, let's say of a "positive nature", it is added also a negative one: the man uses the *language-use* by and large and the discourse especially – namely the individual form of the *language-use* itself – just in order to refuse the time, in order to attempt dominating the time, or rightly to go out the time (Coșeriu 2009: 333)
Representation	The representation is a function of the virtual sign; a word, thought even only once, it has signification and, by this, it has "representation" – before and regardless being eventually used in an enunciation. It is very difficult to perceive a linguistic sign exclusively in its materiality, as pure acoustic image. (…) The representation belongs, therefore really, to the sign, so that it appears (…) as an internal function of the sign. In order to distinguish, relatedly to this internal function of the sign, the sing's capacity of representation in the concrete act of speaking, Kainz introduced the term Bericht: " announcement (Coșeriu 2013: 103-104)
Rhythm / duration: of the narrated time	The duration of each narrated time, which corresponds to the rhythm of the narrated time, it can differ: it is very short for "real" times, quite long and relatively long for short and very short real times, but which are told with all the "details"; namely, one can tall a story in an accelerated rhythm or in a slow rhythm (Coșeriu 2009: 350)
Russian School	The Russian structuralism comes, in essence, from Baudouin de Courtenay. Its main representatives were L.V. Scerba, with his "school" from Leningrad, and E. D. Polivanov (the first one equally influenced by D. Jones and P. Passy). In the Soviet Union existed (in the "School from Moscow") researchers way more close to the Occidental structuralism, and almost Saussurian, like A.S. Reformatskij. But, by and large, during the period dominated by the doctrine or Marr, the "soviet" structuralism didn't have great possibilities of development (except, perhaps, for phonology). After the official condemnation of the "Marr-ism", the younger got closer to the Occidental structuralism, especially to the North-American one. Some researchers applied structuralist methods or developed their own theories (thus, V.V. Ivanov, J.D. Apresjan, J.A. Mel'cuk and, especially, S.A. Saumjan). In the

227

	same time, the interest in the studies of Baudouin de Courtenay increased, being manifested in publishing an anthology of his studies on general linguistics. But all of these didn't generate a structuralist "current", so that the image of a Soviet flourishing and multilateral structuralism, circulating in several Occidental countries, it is mostly false (Coșeriu 2000: 119)

S

Semantemes	The "semantemes" being the forms having lexical signified (Coșeriu 2000: 102)
Semantic change	The speaker can use a sign with a signified other than the generally accepted signified (Coșeriu 1999: 57)
Semantic interpretation	The "semantic interpretation" of a polysemic signifier (rigorously speaking, the identification of several "signified" which aren't analyzed as such) it is done as it would represent the division of a bigger syntagmatic unit in smaller units, a or as these "signified" would be "components" combined in syntagms on diverse levels (Coșeriu 2000: 154)
Semantic objects	The semantic objects are of several types: countable and uncountable, natural and fabricated, being and things etc. (Nida 2004: 47)
Semantic structure	Thus, in the functional (semantic) structure there is, in each case, a basic value of the entire paradigm, a "basis form comparison" and the semantic differentiated elements characteristic to any unit that is combined differently in different units (Coșeriu 2000: 147)
Semantics	The relation between the material linguistic sign (the "signifier") and the signified it constitutes the specific object of the semantics (from Greek: sema: "sign"), or the science of the signified (Coșeriu 1999: 95)

There are, on the other hand, researchers considering as semantics' object the general study of the entire intellectual aspect of the *language-use* (which, to the majority of the linguists, it belongs to grammar). This position is adopted especially by logicians (the School from Vienna and the Polish School(, who, lately, they have been extensively occupying themselves with the study of the "semantics", though from a different point of view than that of the linguistics and with other finalities. To the most part of the linguists, instead, the semantics is, firstly, the science of the word's signified, namely it is a part of the lexicography or, rather, of the lexicology (given the fact that the term lexicography designates, especially the applied lexicology - or the art of making dictionaries) (Coșeriu 1999: 95) |
| Semasiology | Distinguishing between the static and the dynamic aspects, some linguists propose a differentiation between a synchronic science, |

	the semasiology, and a diachronic science or the properly-called semantics; but this distinction is, largely, not applied (Coșeriu 1999: 95)
Sememics	Study referring to substance (Coșeriu 2000: 90)
Semiotic double report in texts	In texts one must ascertain a double semiotic report. The linguistic signs constituting the text, they firstly signify and designate something we can understand, in our quality as knowers of just these signs and of the rules of using them; this is the first semiotic report. Theoretically, it is possible to understand everything on the first semiotic level, without having a clue about what it means on the second semiotic level (Coșeriu 2013: 81)
Sentences	The sentences, from the same point of view, are ensembles of phonic groups, characterized by a complete melodic curve (Coșeriu 1999: 125)
Sign	We usually understand through sign an "instrument" serving to express an idea, a concept, or a sentiment, which the sign itself doesn't' coincide to: an instrument evoking a concept in the virtue of a "convention" and in conformity with a determined tradition, though, which doesn't have with the evoked concept any necessary relation of cause-effect type, or vice versa (Coșeriu 1999: 19) The scholars consider the *language-use*'s signs (the words) as some kind of "stimuli" which some images would correspond to, as "reactions". This conception is, without any doubt, seriously founded from psychological point of view, but it cannot explain in a satisfying manner the jump from the "thing"-sign to the "substitution"-sign, or the conventionalize instrument and element of culture belonging to a certain community (Coșeriu 1999: 20) It is often said that the society imposed to the speaker the signs which he must use. This thing was expressed, somehow paradoxically, by Ferdinand de Saussure, when he remarked that the speaker cannot change the sign, given the fact that the sign is imposed to him, but, on the other hand, the speaker changes the signs, he invents them, and the signs created in speaking they always pass into *language*. This affirmation, which seems to contain an obvious contradiction, it reflects, rigorously, the reality itself of the *language-use* (Coșeriu 1999: 64) Actually, the speaker created to himself the signs according to the norms in effect within his community, and he cannot, by any means, to select them according to purely arbitrary criteria, for in such a case they would contravene to the finality of the *language-use* which is the intercommunication; the individual would remain isolated within his community, and he would cause within it upsetting reactions. It is a known fact that, as in the fashion phenomena, it becomes ridicule somebody who doesn't' dress

himself up "like the others", likewise in what regards the *language-use*, not only that it remains incomprehensible, but often somebody becomes ridiculous when he doesn't speak "like the other persons" from a certain environment (Coșeriu 2009: 350)

The union between expression and signified it is commonly called as sign. In accordance with this, we should interpret the linguistic fact through what is characteristic to the sign and we should consider the *language-use* as partial domain in the ample world of the signs. Though, when it comes about *language-use*, the signs will be, without any doubt, a very comfortable and useful term, but only if interpreted correctly, better said, if the two faces of the sign: the expression and the content, the "signifier" and the "signified". The sign doesn't stay for ("another thing") something extralinguistic, but it only can be oriented towards designating the extralinguistic. Instead, using the term sign it produces the impression that, before *language-use*, there would have existed a signandum; and on this way one can very easily end to consider the *language-use* only as a simple designation system ("nomenclature") for things already given as such. If such a conception is adopted, to the *language-use*'s domain it will remain only the material sign, while the content will be considered as something extralinguistic (Coșeriu 2009: 46)

Concerning the material sign, this one serves, in the first place, for fixing the significations and only on the second plan and together with the signified, it can be used in order to designate the extralinguistic (Coșeriu 2009: 47)

The sign is an organon, an instrument which somebody says to somebody else something about things (Coșeriu 2013: 85-86)

The signs can be translated exactly, through the mediation of the words, or, simply, they represent words and phrases (Coșeriu 1999: 22)

The signs themselves – by applying the trichotomy already signaled by Buhler – they can be "symptoms", on the measure they refer to the speaker and they have a manifestation function or expression; "signals", when referring to listener and having a calling function; and "symbols" on the measure they refer to significations (concepts) and they have a representation function. In what regards the last aspect, Buhler didn't speak about concepts, but he spoke about objects. But between the (material) signs and the objects there is no direct relation: the signs refer to objects through the mediation of the signification, what Gardiner calls meaning, and Ogden and Richards [The Meaning of Meaning, London, 1923], reference, so that they distinguish them from thing meant and referent (Coșeriu 1999: 93)

Sign's form (referring to the expression's plan)	Through the term "form of the sign" (referring to the expression's plan) we want to understand other aspect too, as there is, for instance, the dimension, the extension of each sign taken individually or of the chains of signs, as also those purely quantitative-numerical relations amongst the signs within text, which we have already mentioned under another aspect and which have been gathered together in the antique rhetoric under the name of numerus (Coșeriu 2013: 132)
Sign's function regarding the things and the situations	Regarding the things and the situations, the sign's function would be that of representing. To Buhler, the "representation" (Darstellung) it is the truly characteristic function of the *language* and, equally, the most important function of the *language* – as it already shows the subtitle of his main work: "Theory of the *Language-use*; the Representation Function of the *Language-use*" (Coșeriu 2013: 87-88)
Sign's function relating to the listener	Relating to the listener, the sign's function would be that of asking the listener to do something – in an extreme case, nothing else but to receive the sign as such and to interpret it. Of course, in other cases, one can ask for more: the listener can be asked for keep quiet, or to bring a chair. It can be claimed almost any imaginable action – but, in extreme case, at least the availability of receiving and interpreting the sign. In the first formulation of his theory, Buhler chose for this function too, a very appropriate name: "triggering" (Auslösung), but he later replaced it for the less appropriate "appeal" (Coșeriu 2013: 97)
Sign's function relating to the speaker	Relating to the speaker, the sign's function would consists of "notifying" or of "expressing" the psychic state of the speaker (or his state by and large). In the first formulation of his theory,. Buhler speaks in this sense about "notification" (Kundgabe), and later about "expression" (Ausdruck). From this perspective, the sign could be a notification, a speaker's manifestation, it would tell something about the speaker, for instance if the speaker is man or woman, an older person or a child, an educated individual or an illiterate, or if, in the moment of speaking, he/she is in a peaceful state or angry, and many other things (Coșeriu 2013: 87)
Signals	They precede *idealiter* in the act of speaking (Coșeriu 2013: 103)
Signification	The aspect of the *language-use* constituting to us the fundamental and determined part, it is the intellectual aspect: the signification (Coșeriu 1999:94) The totality of what a certain *language* expresses as such, the totality of what one understand only through *language*, through a *language*, it can be considered, at its turn, as a special type of linguistic content. This is the type of content which I call as signification (Coșeriu 2013: 79)
Signified	The mental content of the linguistic sign (Coșeriu 2000) As type of linguistic content, the signified is the content of a sign

	or of an expression, given in a certain *language*, and exclusively through the mediation of that *language* itself (Coșeriu 2000: 247)
	The signified, therefore, it only implies the possibility of the "entity" – a "to-be-so-and-so" – but not the entity itself. Only on secondary plan, the *language-use* can reach to designate the entity through the mediation of "to-be-so-and-so". "the fact of being a tree" ("the quality of being a tree" is primary, and applying it to trees, to the entities corresponding to such a mode of existence, it is a secondary fact. But the simple possibility is something universal; consequently, only through the mediation of a secondary operation of individualization, starting from universal, the *language-use* can reach to designate the individual examples of the "to-be-so-and-so". And, the historically fixed individual designations – the "proper names" – are, int his regard, a secondary phenomenon, presupposing the understanding of the universal (there are proper names only for entities already called through appellatives and not vice versa) (Coșeriu 2009: 48)
Signifier	The material part of the linguistic sign (Coșeriu 2000)
Signifying function	The signifying function must be understood from the *language-use* point of view as energeia, in other words, as creator activity (Coșeriu 2009: 47)
Signs system	Through "signs system" we must understand both the historical *language* and the "functional" *language* (Coșeriu 2013: 110)
Signs' identity	With a certain approximation and with a notable degree of abstraction, one can speak about the "identity" of the signs which we encounter in the linguistic acts of a community, acts considered spatially (under geographical aspect) or in time (under historical aspect) or, also, in their social and cultural stratification (Coșeriu 1999: 16)
Silence	The silence has a meaning – better said, the silence can, together with the linguistic signified, contribute to the meaning of a discourse – but it isn't by any means a language-use, since it doesn't have its own signified (Coșeriu 2009: 37)
	The silence can be symbolic too; the fact of not saying anything/something it can have a special meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 142)
Sin-phasic units / styles (of languages)	Units of expressive modality, without diaphasic differences, namely sin-phasic unit or styles of language (for instance: familiar style, literary style, epic style etc.) (Coșeriu 2000: 267)
Sin-stratum units / levels (of language)	Units considered in a sole social-cultural stratum or which (practically) do not present diversity from this point of view: sin-stratum unities or levels of language (the so-called "social dialects") (Coșeriu 2000: 267)
Sin-topical units / dialects (of languages)	Units considered in a sole point of the space or which (practically) do not present spatial variety, namely sin-topical units or dialects

	(a term that could be applied to all type of regional varieties included in the historical language: but also to the ones of the common language) (Coșeriu 2000: 266-267)
Situational conditioning of the texts	Again differently from *languages*, the texts are situationally conditioned. On each time, the texts are in a specific extraverbal context and they receive their meaning only through the mediation of this context (Coșeriu 2013: 69)
Situations (of speaking)	Through "situation" we understand the non-linguistic environment of the sign or of the sequence of signs, the circumstances accompanying the act of speaking, eventually also certain information about which the speaker mutually presupposes that the listener has it (Coșeriu 2013: 138)
	Through situation I understand something much more specific than what is usually understood and, in addition to that, I also believe that this deviation from the general use it is justified and even necessary. When we speak about "situation" we exclusively refer to the circumstances and to the relations in space and time, which appear through the speaking itself, by the fact that somebody speaks to someone about something on a certain palce from the space and in a certain context. The situation is, therefore, the frame which *me* and *you* appear through, here and there, now and then, that spatial-temporal continuum, which is built up "around the speaker" through the act of speaking, and through which the diverse spatial, temporal, and personal deictics, they can designate something concrete beyond their categorial signification (Coșeriu 2013: 139-140)
	Inside the situation I distinguish between non-mediated situation and mediated situation. The non-mediated situation is constituted of the effective spatial and temporal reports, occurring through the act of speaking, which is their reference point. A non-mediated situation is given when I, as speaker, at the place and in the moment of the speaking, I utter *me*, here and now. In the case of the mediated situation, this reference point moves "towards exterior". It is not *me* but it is a tale teller *me*; *here* it isn't *here*, but it is the *here* of the things and of the events which it is told about, events which, also, they can have their own *now*, which isn't mandatorily coinciding to that *now* of the concrete act of speaking (Coșeriu 2013: 140)
Social level of the *language-use*	In all *languages* there are at least five different levels, including the ritualic *language-use* the formal *language-use*, the informal *language-use*, the familial *language-use*, and the intimate *language-use* (Nida 2004: 161)
Sociological currents in linguistics	The sociological currents in linguistics are focused, instead, upon the relations between the variety of the *language* and the structuring (stratification) of the society (Coșeriu 2000: 61)
Sociological functions of the *languages*	The sociological functions can be, probably, the best to be described as being: interpersonal, informative, performative, and

	emotive (Nida 2004: 159)
Sonant / "consonants"	This distinction serves, also, for explaining another distinction, very used in linguistics: that one opposing the sonant and the "consonants". This opposition, purely linguistic and physiological, it is based on the function of the sounds within syllable (their capacity or their incapacity of constituting the syllabic nucleus) (Coșeriu 1999: 112) The sounds which can form the syllable without the help of a sound, they aren't sonant (Coșeriu 1999: 112) Are "consonants" the sounds which can compose a syllable only with the help of a sonant (Coșeriu 1999: 112)
Sonorous waves	(the qualities of the sound of the language-use) highlighted and measurable in the graphical representation of a corresponding sonorous wave, which is obtained with an apparatus called as chimograph (from Greek: kyma: wave, and graphein: "to write") (Coșeriu 1999: 103)
Spatial/geographical linguistics	The geographical linguistics, mainly understood as doctrine and technique used in the linguistic history, it is called today also as spatial linguistics. In this form it has been applied to some spatial outdated relations, especially in the domain of the Indo-European linguistics by Bartoli himself and by Vittore Pisani (Coșeriu 1999: 101)
Speaker's awareness (criterion of *languages*' identification)	Some linguistic aspects belong to a certain historical *language*, if the speaker is aware of he speaks that language, so that his speaking belongs to a certain linguistic system. This criterion is surer than the previous one (inter-comprehensibility, E. l. t.'s n.), but neither this is universal, for there are cases which that awareness lacks or it presents some limits in (Coșeriu 1999: 34)
Speaking	Concretization of a linguistic technique, or the linguistic concrete activity (Coșeriu 2000: 10) The speaking corresponds, more or less, to parole, a term introduced by F. de Saussure (Coșeriu 2000: 277) The speaking represents an idiomatic technique effectively concretized; (…) But, of course, in addition to concretizing a traditional technique, the speaking contains an entire series of own determinations which, actually, they highlight it, they make it singular, they make it, on each case, "inedited" (Coșeriu 2000: 277)
Speaking – congruent	When the speaking corresponds to the expectations we have regarding the first level, that of the elocutionary knowledge, then I call this speaking as congruent (or coherent). Such a speaking will be clear, logic, and coherent, mainly in what regards the general principles of the thinking; it will be founded on the supposedly general knowledge of the things inside a given community, on a given moment. The term congruent it refers, therefore, to

	everything that doesn't depend on knowing a certain language, neither on the capacity of building up certain texts (Coșeriu 2013: 72)
Speaking's line	For the speaking's line is a unique line, it is not possible to present simultaneously, in the same discourse, two or more parallel actions. Each action has its own time, so that to a series of parallel actions it corresponds a series of different "temporal lines", meaning that in a discourse – which can narrate a sole action at a time – they can only be presented successively. If two or more actions intersect with one another, in a unique event, they can be considered together regarding that event, but not as autonomous actions (Coșeriu 2009: 352)
Speaking's linguistics	The "speaking's linguistics" should study just the universal technique of the speaking as such. Of course, if it is true that we always speak according to a certain historical technique, it won't be less true that we speak (before all) also in accord with a universal technique. This is for, when we speak, we do not use only the *language* ("the idiomatic competence") but, to the same extent, we use some universal possibilities of the *language-use* (for instance, the intonation) and a series of expressive non-"linguistic" possibilities (the mimic, the gestures), as well as some principles of the thinking valid for mankind by and large, and the constant reference to extralinguistic facts: objective contexts, situations, the general knowledge of the "world". Some of these aspects can be, partially "historical"; thus, using some gestures corresponding to the tradition of a certain community, and in order to establish an effective and complete communication with persons belonging to other communities, it can be interesting to identity the gestures used in these communities (and to what extent they are used). But, often, it is about effectively "universal" facts; anyway, the possibility of using such facts in speaking it is a "universal" possibility (Coșeriu 2000: 240)
Speaking's meta-*language-use*	When using a word, we can refer not only to the object or to the situation designated by the respective word, but also to the word itself (Coșeriu 2011: 180)
Special *languages*	Are called as special *languages* the speaking modes characteristic to social or professional groups, as also the technical *language-use*(s) too (for instance, the *language* of the: sailors, fishermen, students, engineers, metallurgists etc.) which exist, along the dialects and the common *languages*, as special forms of theirs, and which often are also called as slangs, despite the fact that this term is reserved often for the malefactors' *language-use* and, by and large, for the linguistic systems employed within the same common *language*, on the purpose of not being understood by the person who do not belong to certain communities, or a secret *languages* (Coșeriu 1999: 45)
Special literary forms	The approximate imitation of the dialects can lead even to the apparition of some special literary forms (Coșeriu 2013: 119)
Specialized /	There are linguistic usages which the signification coincides to

terminological linguistic usage	designation in. This type of linguistic usage is, usually, called as specialized or terminological. In the case of the specialized terminologies or varieties of a certain language, the signification coincides to the designation, so that the corresponding linguistic signs can have -as they usually say – "the same signification" in different languages or even in all languages. In such cases, for instance in the chemistry specialized terms, the idiomatic delimitation of the contents it simply corresponds to the objective configuration of the respective science domain. Such a linguistic usage exists on the texts' level too; there are texts which the meaning coincides in, to the signification and to the designation. If the author producing such a text was asked, what is he referring to, he could answer, impassibly: "I am referring myself exactly to what I am saying". Here isn't anything to be understood under the form of an autonomous meaning, which the said things would be only sign bearers for, namely signifier (Coșeriu 2013: 82)
Stratificational grammar	The only one (amongst the American bloomfieldian orientations) that has reached to constitute an autonomous orientation, it is the stratificational grammar of S. M. Lamb, who starts from some works of Hockett and, in its intentions this grammar should represent a synthesis between the American structuralism and glossematics. This type of grammar (in reality, it is about a theory of the language) is characterized by the fact that it distinguishes in the linguistic systems a series of structural layers (in classical version and at least for some *languages*, six layers) connected to one another by the fact that each inferior stratum "does" or it "represents" the superior stratum. (…) Both through the principles and methods which it applies, this orientation – interesting and new especially in the domain of the morphology – it remains in the domain of the structuralism, and it can be considered as an individual form and as a development of the structuralism (Coșeriu 2000: 130)
Stratificational linguistic theory	Sidney Lamb (1966) promoted a stratified perspective upon language-use, within which he distinguished three major strata, namely: the semiology, the grammar, the phonology, having each level divide in two components, resulting thus six strata. The relation amongst and inside the diverse strata form complex networks, which reduce everything, in the end, to sets of relations. Consequently, the meaning of a word represents a set of its semantical traits (Nida 2004: 55)
Structural diachronic semantics	Namely the functional study of the semantic changes in lexicon (Coșeriu 2000: 68)
Structural linguistics	An individual type of descriptive linguistics (Coșeriu 1999: 73) In the structural linguistics, referring both to the linguistic units of the expression's plan (phonemes or, in glossematics: "cenemes") and to the *language* units by and large, there are approached two fundamental problems: that of the identification of the units, and

| | that of describing these units (often, erroneously called as "defining"). Firstly, there is the problem of the identification; for instance, if "b" form the Spanish "ambros" (pronounced [b]) and that one from the Spanish "cabo" (pronounced [6]), they represent the same *language* unit, or we deal with two different units? And after identifying the two sound as corresponding to the same unit, this unit must be described. Or, the two operations are performed differently by the structuralist "schools" (Coșeriu 2000: 98)

Through "structural linguistics" we will understand, in a first moment and only provisory, any form of the *languages*' linguistics referring to the notion of "structure" which the "structural" qualificative has been applied to (Coșeriu 2009: 50) |
|---|---|
| Structural or functional grammar | A special form of the descriptive grammar it is the structural or the functional grammar, which studies the forms and the functions of a *language* as elements of a "structure", namely by considering them from the point of view of the distinctive oppositions established in a system and by ordering the forms in conformity with their functional values. The new descriptive grammars, due to progressively liberating from the traditional models offered by the classic *languages*' grammars and, especially, consequently to the influence exercised in this domain by F. de Saussure and then by the Copenhagen School and by the Prague phonology, they tend, by and large, to be structural grammars (Coșeriu 1999: 99)

A Spanish structural grammar ("of the Spanish *language*"), even a simple descriptive grammar of the "Spanish *language*" – namely a simultaneous description of all the modalities belonging to the Spanish *language* (dialects, levels, *language* structures) [it is a totally impossible enterprise. It is true, though, that in the structural grammar the exigency to limit each case to a functional *language* it is maintained in the most case. But very rarely, such an exigency is admitted explicitly (Coșeriu 2000: 74) |
| Structuralism | The structuralism (equally so the "asemantic" one) it conceives the *language* as a system of signs, namely of forms (and combinations of forms) having certain semantic functions used, in speaking, in order to designate what corresponds to these functions (Coșeriu 2000: 132)

The structuralism represents an analytical method: it aims to establish what the *languages* are made like (Coșeriu 2000: 133)

The structuralism aims to analyze each *language* and its functional units, in order to reach the *language*'s constitutive elements (Coșeriu 2000: 133)

To the structuralism, the basic unit is the minimal differential element of form or of function (Coșeriu 2000: 133) |

The structuralism is "idiomatic" or "immanentist", by not admitting another deep structure than the semantic structure characteristic to any *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 135)

By and large, the structuralism, in all its forms, it takes in account both the paradigmatic structure and the syntagmatic structure and, in a way or another, both what is material and what is functional, though the term of *structure* is applied, in certain 'schools" only – or mainly – to the syntagmatic structure. Regarding the paradigmatic structure, they speak, depending on the case, about "patterns", about "systems", and about "componential analysis". There are, doubtlessly, notable differences, and not only terminological ones, between the European structuralism and the North-America structuralism, amongst the diverse structuralist "schools", and even amongst the personal conceptions and methods of the representatives belonging to the same "school". Thus, sometimes it isn't made the distinction between the functional syntagmatic structure and the material or combinatory structure; some other times, they do not distinguish (or they do not clearly distinguish) between paradigms and syntagmatic classes. The North-American structuralism, as methodology, it focuses mainly upon the material structures than upon the content's structures, and in the superior "syntax" it insists more upon the syntagmatic combinatory structures than upon the functional syntagmatic and paradigmatic functions. The European structuralism, excepting the phonetics, it focuses rather upon the content's structures than upon the material structures and, letting aside the grammar of "dependences", more upon the paradigmatic structures than upon the syntagmatic ones. But it is about methodological preferences – justified, by and large, by the mode of conceiving the *language-use* and/or the science -, about the mode of approaching the diverse "structures", given the fact that in reality the "rest" isn't ignored, namely what isn't take in consideration in practice, in the first place. In structuralism they consider, explicitly or mutually, that the grammatical paradigm (and, by and large, the semantic structure) it is the one characterizing and distinguishing, in the first place, the *languages*; instead, in the transformational grammar, which doesn't approach the idiomatic functions of the functional units, it is recognized only the combinatory syntagmatic structure (inherited as such from the Bloomfieldian syntax of the "immediate constituents", but attributed to the "deep structure"), being ignored the paradigms and the paradigmatic structures which cannot be established in a sentence, but only when different sentences oppose to one another (Coșeriu 2000: 152-152)

The structuralism – more exactly, the structuralism s such – it aims to analyze the *languages* in their functional particularities and, by reducing them to their minimal elements, it aims to

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>establish the paradigms of the linguistic units through certain procedures on identification and analysis. The general orientation of the structuralism is, consequently, analytical. Just because of that, the problems approach by the "structuralism" in a strict sense, they differ from the problems recently treated by the generative-transformational grammar which, as we've seen, it is sometimes included in "structuralism" (in an ampler sense) (Coșeriu 2000: 158)

In structuralism (…) the *language* is conceived as a competence, and "identifying and analyzing the *language*'s units" it equals to identifying and analyzing the units integrated by the linguistic knowledge of the speaker (Coșeriu 2000: 158)

The structuralism starts from what is empirically given, from what is "produced" (sentences and "texts") towards competence, aspiring to discover, by analyzing what has been produced, the respective competence and its structures (inclusively in the case of an unknown *language* (Coșeriu 2000: 160)

The structuralism identifies the description to analysis, and it doesn't occupy itself with the production of the sentences (Coșeriu 2000: 160)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Structuralist orientations</td><td>In a broad sense, inclusively the generative grammar. The idea of the primate of the *language* state and of the description it is, in reality, wide-spread, and in different forms, sometimes attenuated or non-obvious at the first glance, it is accepted also by the non-structuralist historians, including here some adversary of the structuralism (Coșeriu 2000: 74)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Structure (the concept of structure)</td><td>Common to several "structuralist" orientations, as also to some orientations calling themselves as such but not being structuralist in reality, it is the concept of "structure". This concept is in itself univocal, structure meaning "the form of the internal relations of an object or of a certain domain"; but, usually, it is used with implicit determinations, so that what is designated through this term it can be very different, according to the types of relations considered or are presupposed on each case. In linguistics, this concept has at least three different applications, given the fact that through each structure one can understand: a) what is here we are going to call it as associative configuration; b) "syntagmatic" structure; c) "paradigmatic" structure. In addition that that, the last two ones, at their turn, they can be considered in a material sense or in a functional ("semantical") sense (Coșeriu 2000: 137)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Structure facts of a *language*</td><td>The structure facts of a *language* (excepting the case of the homophonous and the "synonymous" forms) they correspond to the formula: Namely, different forms for different values (Coșeriu 2000: 279)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Structuring plans</td><td>As we demonstrated in another place, the structuring plans which we must distinguish, are four in number, namely: the</td></tr>
</table>

	concretization's plan (the concrete speaking or the speaking) and three plans of properly-said technique or the virtual technique (the competence as such): the norm, the *language*'s system, and the linguistic type (Coșeriu 2000: 276)
Style of value (Hjelmslev)	High style, humble style, neutral style (Coșeriu 2013: 152)
Stylistics	It studies the linguistic signs as symptoms and signals, namely in their functions of expressing and calling. There are in *languages* phenomena belonging especially to the "affective" aspect, studied by stylistics (as there are: the augmentatives, the diminutives, the different hyperbolic creations, the expression having an ironical value, the special forms of the imperative etc.); but, like the grammar too, the stylistics also studies the entire constitutive material of the *language*, given the fact that any phenomenon – even those which seem, at a first glance, as belonging exclusively to the enunciative *language-use* – they still can have a stylistic use (Coșeriu 1999: 97-98) The stylistics can be the study of the emotive convention, already generalized in a *language* (The *language*'s stylistics) and in this sense it was thought by Charles Bally (Precis de stylistique, Geneva, 1905); but it can be, equally, the study of the linguistic creation characteristic to an author or to a work, study involving the valuing of the creation itself from aesthetical point of view or from the point of view of the harmonious relation between expression and the individual structure of the original world suggested by a work or by an author ("the stylistics of the speaking"), an in this sense it was conceived by Gustav Grober and, especially, by Karl Vossler and by the linguists belonging to his school (or orientation) (Leo Spitzer, Helmut Hatzfeld etc.). (Coșeriu 1999: 98) The stylistics too, it can be synchronic or diachronic, and the last one, at its turn, it is conceived either as autonomous, or as included in the historical grammar (Coșeriu 1999: 99)
Stylistics of the deviation	The question referring to meaning it is most often raised only in connection with the literary or poetical texts, and the sole relatively systematical method proposed until now for treating all the problems, it is the so-called "stylistic of the deviation". At the basis of this type of stylistics is stays the implicit hypothesis that the meaning results out of the deviation from the norm, that the style is born as deviation from something usual. This hypothesis must be rejected (Coșeriu 2013: 83) The "stylistics of the deviation" is based, obviously, on the fundamental supposition that the daily *language-use* would represent the "normal" type of speaking, and the poetical *language-use* would represent the "abnormal" one. Such

	supposition is acceptable, though, only form statistical perspective, but not regarding to the *language-use*'s essence too (Coșeriu 2013: 171)
Stylistics of the *language*	To the rhetoric, partially eliminated from school – especially as a consequence of the anti-normative attitudes regarding the *language-use*, attitudes manifested in the past century and especially in our century – it is felt its necessity lately, and they come back to rhetoric on diverse paths, starting with the so-called "stylistics of the *language*" founded by Ch. Bally, a discipline aiming to study the "affective" and "expressive" facts contained in *languages* (Coșeriu 2000: 15) The linguistic discipline capable of capturing the *language-use* in its original moment, it is, according to the idealism, the stylistics. Consequently, the texts' stylistics (of that of the "speaking") it will constitute for this current the primary and central discipline of the entire linguistics (Coșeriu 2000: 84)
Stylistic usage	Any phenomenon – even those which seem , at a first glance, that they exclusively belong to the enunciative language-use – it can have a stylistic usage, namely a usage implying and revealing an attitude of the speaker (Coșeriu 1999: 98)
Sub-distinction	The neutrality and the sub-distinction must be, therefore, considered as strictly contrary phenomena. The methodological criterion is the following: if an opposition is suspended only in certain contexts, it will be about neutralization; if a distinction is made only in certain contexts, then it will be about sub-distinction (Coșeriu 2000)
Subordination (the levels of the idiomatic structuring)	The subordination is the opposite of the supra-ordination, namely it is a general possibility consisting of the facts that the unit belonging from constitutive point of view to a certain grammatical level, they are "demoted in rank" and they function on an inferior level. In the domain of the macro-syntax, namely of the syntax of the period, we traditionally speak about coordinator conjunctions and subordinator conjunctions. Due to various reasons, this distinction isn't acceptable. The coordination is a relation between elements having the same rank, and the subordination is, *per definitionem*, a relation between element of different ranks. If the subordination really is in a direct opposition with another procedure, that this will be the supra-ordination and not the coordination. Besides, the coordinator conjunctions must be considered rather some type of prepositions, a fact that could be demonstrated also by presenting a series of periphrastic relations; but we have here a problem that should be discussed within a lecture on syntax (Coșeriu 2013: 220)
Substitution (of the levels of the idiomatic structuring)	The substitution it is treated in the traditional grammar only relatedly to the pronouns, in a strict sense. By reading the school grammars edited as compendium, in reader can be awakened the impression that the substitution, as general possibility, it can affect only a part of the word's level. The substitution is, in reality, an

	ampler function of the *languages*, and it doesn't concern only the forms classified by the traditional grammar as *pronomina* (Latin) (…) , but an entire series of other procedures which an element of what it is said it is anticipated or reiterated through, without being repeated, simply, in its whole extent. In principle, the possibility of substitution exists on all levels (…) About the mode which the substitutions are made in different *languages* we know only very few things (in this sense, very valuable indications we are offered, as we've already mentioned it, in the chapter entitles *Substitution* form the work *Language* of Bloomfield). Even for *languages* well studies in certain regards, as there are, for instance, the Romance *languages*, there lack thorough researches regarding the limits of applicability of the diverse substitutive procedures, well known in themselves (Coșeriu 2013: 223-224)
Substratum	In the case of the substratum it is about preservation phenomena (or about elements of the previous *language* preserved in the new *language*; Celtic elements have been preserved in the French *Language*, especially in the rural areas, more conservative one), but, from the point of view of the *language* superimposed to this substratum, they are, of course, innovations (Coșeriu 1999: 82)
Supra-ordination)of the levels of the idiomatic structuring)	In the case of the supra-ordination it is about the general possibility of the units from on an inferior level to appear in the place of the units from on a superior level. This characteristic can be understood, of course, as a combination with a zero element too. Thus, it is possible that to the rank of words to accede minimal elements as, for instance, the inflexible words incorporated inside syntagms. In addition to that, the minimal elements can function as whole enunciations or even as texts (…) An empirical task of the trans-phrasal analysis it is that of establishing, if necessary, which elements can function on the text's level and which cannot (Coșeriu 2013: 219)
Supra-stratum	The *language* superimposed on another *language*, without reaching to eliminate the second *language* (Coșeriu 1999: 82)
Surrounding environment	The surrounding environment is a socially and culturally determined region, as, for instance, the family, the school, the professional community, or the caste. On one hand, an surrounding environment can have specific signs for objects belonging to a much more extended domain (…); on the other hand, the environment can have special signs for object belonging only to it. In such a case, the environment would concomitantly represent some kind od micro-domain too (Coșeriu 2013: 134)
Suspend, to (linguistically)	The word *suspend* must be understood here in the sense which it is used in philosophy with. Therefore " suspended" it doesn't mean "eliminated"; what isn't correct it remains absolutely recognizable in what is adequate, in this special case being only – to say so – "out of function". This justifies once more the acceptation of the autonomy of the text's level. There is a special knowledge for texts and there is also a special evaluation for texts, an evaluation taking in account the adequation referring to each text,

	independently from the linguistical correctness or from congruence (Coșeriu 2013: 73)
Syllable	It is called as syllable the smallest phonic group that can be pronounced as such (namely: as isolated group) (Coșeriu 1999: 112)
Symbol for a certain meaning	What in a text, especially in a literary text, it is designated – it is, at its turn, a symbol for a certain meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 81)
Symbolic signs systems	The systems of symbolic signs used by the people, are quite numerous: beside the articulated *language-use*, there can be considered as "*language-use*(s)" all the signaling systems (with flags, with luminous signals etc.) and any other system expressing or communicating something in a symbolic of conventional manner. So it happens, for instance, in the art's case, under all its aspects, from music to dance, with the gestures, with the writing, and with other conventional symbolical *language-use*(s), from that one of the "flowers" to that of the "play cards", to the traffic signals (Coșeriu 1999: 22)
Symptoms	They function only within the act of speaking (Coșeriu 2013: 103)
Synchronic grammar	Namely the study of a linguistic system on a given moment or outside the time (Coșeriu 1999: 98)
Synchronic science (of the language)	Referring to a language considered in a certain moment of its development (making abstraction of the time factor) (Coșeriu 1999: 73)
Syncretism	The syncretism (…) is the material non-manifestation, in a section of a paradigm or in a paradigm, of a distinction of content which, in other sections of that paradigm or in other analogue paradigms belonging to the same *language*, it manifests under material aspect too: the coincidence in expression of two (or more) different contents in a certain paradigm (Coșeriu 2000: 212)

Given the fact that there are paradigms of combinations of linguistic forms, there can be syntactic syncretisms too (Coșeriu 2000: 213)

The syncretism can be present, also, in lexicon, more precisely in the paradigms which are "lexical fields" (Coșeriu 2000: 213)

The syncretism refers to the relation between content and expression: to the manifestation of the content through the mediation of the expression (Coșeriu 2000: 214)

Consequently, the so-called material "neutralizations" of the grammatical or lexical forms (…) they do not represent to us new neutralizations, but syncretisms (Coșeriu 2000: 214) |
| Syntagm / syntagmatic unit | Any combination of signs having an own and coherent signified, it is a syntagm (…) or a syntagmatic unit (Coșeriu 2000: 141) |

Syntagmatic axis	Or the axis of combining and ordering, which corresponds to the signs' succession in the "speaking's chain" (Coșeriu 2000: 139) The syntagmatic axis is unmoving (Coșeriu 2000: 140) On the syntagmatic axis, the relations between the linguistic signs, by being in praesentia, it is of "joining" type ("both a and b") (Coșeriu 2000: 140) The syntagmatic axis corresponds to this succession of signs (it is the ideal line which the signs are ordered on) (Coșeriu 2000: 140)
Syntagmatic classes	The terms combining in a certain type of syntagms, they constitute from the point of view of the combining or of the possibility of combining, syntagmatic classes. (…) Likewise, there can be established, on other levels, classes of the "nominal determinators", of the "prepositions", or the "conjunctions" etc. Of course, these classes do not coincide to the paradigms which correspond to the syntagmatic functions, because of referring to the combined units, and not to their combinations. Despite these, if they are strictly delimited, on each functional level of a *language* and not for each syntagmatic type individually, they imply, to say so, the paradigms and they can serve to establish those (Coșeriu 2000: 150)
Syntagmatic functions	Are syntagmatic functions (are purely relational) those of "subject" and "predicate": the predicate is the "referred to" term, the subject is the "referent" term, the syntagmatic function is that of reference, and the resulted unit is "attributed (to an subject) predication", one of the most frequent sentences in our languages, which opposes, on its level, to the "non-attributed (to a subject) predication" (…) The same thing can be said also about "complements" which manifest in this way only in the propositional syntagm (Coșeriu 2000: 149) The syntagmatic functions are, as such, oppositive: "the oppositions" (the paradigmatic differences) aren't presents between their terms, but on each case, between the respective syntagms (Coșeriu 2000: 150)
Syntagmatic positions	On the other hand, certain traditional terms as "subject", "predicate", " attribute", and "complement", they are just classes names or names of "syntagmatic" positions (Coșeriu 2000: 150)
Syntagmatic solidarity	We must notice that, referring to the choosing of the terms, the paradigmatic axis is, on each case, primarily determined, for it corresponds to what we intend to say; in this regard, the "context" refers to another phenomenon: to the syntagmatic solidarity amongst the terms selected out of different paradigms (concordance and rection facts, or simply, facts of traditional fixing of certain syntagms) (Coșeriu 2000: 144)
Syntagmatic structure	Identifying the syntagmatic relations in a syntagm of superior order (syntagm of syntagms) it allows us to establish the

	syntagmatic structure ("the form of the internal relations") of this one; for now, at least as material structure, "additional" or "combinatory" (namely referring to the combinations of its "constituents"), as we all know, intuitively (and explicitly form the primary grades) (Coșeriu 2000: 141)
Synthetical grammar	The synthetical grammar explains "what the grammatical means are used like, in order to structuring the discourse", establishing the rules of producing the sentences (amongst these also some rules called by Gabelentz himself as "transformations") (Coșeriu 2000: 160)
System of dialects	What can us establish the limits of a dialects system like? Often, there are enough the linguistic criteria. (…) Sometimes these criteria aren't though, sufficient. (…) In such cases, the linguist must accept extra-glottological criteria, for instance, political or cultural criteria. Rightly so, the fact that in a certain region (or state) it is used a certain common *language*, or literary, or national, makes us considering the isoglosses systems from the same region as dialects of the common *language*, if between the dialects and the common *language* there are a sufficient number or common isoglosses, namely between those dialects and the common *language* there is a greater intrinsic likeness than between the same dialects and another common *language* (Coșeriu 1999: 36-37)
	Despite all these, we must notice that, from linguistic point of view, the considered dialects do not belong to the common *language* except by their name, because, normally, they do not come out of a division of the common *language*; to the common *language* the dialects are rather "sisters" than "daughters"; rightly so, the common *language* isn't' at its origin but a dialect as any other dialect, or a region or of a city, but which, from political, historical, or cultural (literary) reasons has reached to be national *language* or to be used, on the entire territory taken in consideration, as supra-dialectal *language*, along with the local dialects (Coșeriu 1999: 37)

T	

Tagmemic theory	Kenneth Pike developed a tagmemic theory of the diverse linguistic categories, that could have been applied to some languages belonging to different families. Pike described the linguistic elements depending on the element which they are constituted of, and depending on the position they have. This fact leads to a recognition of the importance of the units and of their hierarchical placing. In tagmemics the accent falls on the idea that the same linguistic element can function as "particle", as "field"

	and as "wave", the field referring to relations, and the wave referring to processes (Nida 2004: 54)
Tagmemics	K.L. Pike, who occupied himself with the phonetic theory, he developed a special syntax (the „tagmemics") (Coșeriu 2000: 127)
Teaching/learning the *languages*	From applicative point of view, of teaching the *languages* – for instance, if it is about teaching the English *language* to the Italian students – one must take in account three aspects of the grammar. Rightly so, when comparing two *language* we can encounter: a) different constructions for analogue functions: it is the case of the article, variable in Italian and unique in English; b) the functional diversity, sometimes with an analogue construction, some other times a different one; it is the case of the English preterit in report with the imperfect and the simple perfect from Italian, and of the English periphrastic conditional, with should + infinitive, differing both in form and in content from the Italian conditional; c) diversity in relations, namely the possible crossings from a paradigm to another; thus, wanting to translate the Italian: ii mio amico e una tua amica, where the elements oppose by pairs (UI una, mio/tua, amico/amica) configuring the two parallel structures, in English we will have to renounce to the parallelism and to the structural homogeneousness, and to say my friend and a girlfriend of yours (Coșeriu 2000: 231)
Technical *language-use*	The science undertakes a special designation of the *language-use* as technical *language-use*, both for what is already given into *language-use* and for what is discovered or delimited by the science itself. Only that, in both meanings, the science finds in *language-use* its basis and its departure point. (The technical *language-use*(s) too, they have their basis what is already in the linguistic traditions the technical *language-use*, namely nomenclature or terminology, a fact that means, actually, a manifestation of a "science", even if of a popular science) (Coșeriu 2009: 50)
Technical *language-use*(s)	In which the signified coincide to the designations (in the sense that they are objectively motivated) – they correspond to the tradition referring to the knowledge of the things themselves; this is valid not only for the sciences' *language-use*(s), and those of the techniques, established as such, but also to the lexicon of the popular science and technique: for everything that in a linguistic tradition is "nomenclature" (names of tools and of parts of tools, names of plants and of animals on species levels etc.) (Coșeriu 2000: 254)
Temporal linearity of the speaking	Due to the temporal linearity – a linearity of "unique sense: and rigorously irreversible – we cannot, in reality, to narrate "inversely", to inverse the direction itself, the temporal orientation of the narrate facts (Coșeriu 2009: 350) We cannot inverse the unique sense line of the speaking, the temporal order of the discourse, which isn't an event that is imagined, but it is an event that is produced. So, we cannot make

	to coincide (from semiotic point of view) this event, necessarily unfolding in the direction characteristic to it, to a fact which unfolds on the opposite direction (Coșeriu 2009: 350)
Temporal order of the discourse	We cannot inverse the unique sense line of the peaking, the temporal order of the discourse, which isn't an imagined event, but it is a produced event. So, we cannot make to coincide (from semiotic point of view) this event which is unfolding, necessarily, on the direction characteristic to it, to a fact unfolding on the opposite direction (Coșeriu 2009: 350)
Temporality (of the language)	It is essential the temporality of the language just as linguistic knowledge, a knowledge that – differently than it is usually considered – it is always reckoned as a knowledge directed towards a moment in the future; even when an innovation is adopted, it is adopted regarding some future linguistic acts which will use it (Coșeriu 2009: 334-335)
Terms: extensive / intensive	The unmarked term of a neutralizable opposition it is called, also, as "extensive", and the marked one it is called, in this case, as "intensive". This is for the last term focuses, as we've seen, upon a section of what is comprised through opposition, while the first one can correspond to another section and to be, in this regard, contrary to the first one, but it can, also, "to extend" upon the entire sphere of the opposition (Coșeriu 2000: 204)
	The semantic relation between the extensive and intensive terms it is important for it elucidates certain "stylistic" uses which, otherwise, seem inexplicable (Coșeriu 2000: 206)
	We must notice that, though, in certain cases, the languages can have available special terms in order to designate the neutral value as such, especially in lexicon. In such cases, the opposite of our term "A" it isn't an unmarked and extensive term, but another marked term; and the neutral term, being "extensive" in itself (and only "extensive"), it isn't actually, "extensive", but it is only "neutral" or "generic" (Coșeriu 2000: 209)
Text	Linguistic sequence, written or spoken, forming a conevtional unit, either regarding a chaining of phrases, a sole phrase, of a fragment of a phrase (O Ducrot, J. M. Shcaeffer, New Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Sciences of the Language-use Romanian translation by Anca Măgureanu, Viorel Vișan, Mariana Păunescu, Editura Babel, Bucharest, 1996, p. 385 (NDESL). (Apud Gruia 2014: 18)
	The text isn't a simple accumulation of phrases, but it is a logical unit determined also by the limits of its articulation: introduction, content, conclusions. The text is the concrete material manifestation of the communication act done in a given situation, which a given locutor (emitter) produces (emits) in, an act of speaking. The text's component elements are combined so that to provide the text with a own structure upheld only also by the

	semantic joining of the phrases (Adam 1999, Genette 1999). The text has a certain function. This one depends on the author's intention (telling a story, explaining, defensing a viewpoint and arguing it, proposing an action etc.). Often, a text presents several traits, being able to fulfill several functions. Because the report between ideas isn't a linear one, its profound structure allows the identification of the pertinent traits. Therefore, a text can be identified grace to its predominant characteristics (Ducrot, Schaeffer 1996: 384-385). (Lungu-Badea 2003: 98) The text is the written form of the discourse (Nida 2004: 63)
Text – descriptive	The descriptive text is often met in literature, especially in narration (Balzac, Zola, Robbe-Grillet), poems in prose or in verses, documentary texts, advertising, touristic guides, selling catalogue, announcements etc. This type of text is characterized by the presence of the perception verbs and of the spatial indicators, of the verbs for states and for movement, by using certain verb tenses, metaphors, and figurate meanings. The action isn't unfolded in time, the description being organized around a lexical field. The description can intervene during a narration too, and after that, the narration can continue its flowing. The register can be contemplative, lyrical (in harmony with the soul's state), criticist or satirical (portraits), realistic (having a narrative function), or poetical. The focusing determines an objective description (documentary), it can have a strictly aesthetical perspective upon the text, or it can have an interest in the unfolding of the narration (Lungu-Badea 2003: 99-100)
Text – informative	The informative or explicative text, it conveys information, it exposes objectively on the purpose of undertaking the analysis and the synthesis of the conceptual representations. It is characterized by using certain verb tenses and it is met in didactical discourses, handbooks, dictionaries, encyclopedias, but also in the erudite literature of the XVII Century etc. The effort of remaining objective it is obvious, being remarked the didactical register. The referential function of the language-use it is predominant (objective data, figures, definitions); the author tries explaining objectively and impersonally the phenomena (by using the third person and the technical vocabulary). The reader can prove a documentary interest but he will have to select the passages which the author's subjectivity is manifested is. These argumentative nuances make of the explicative text an interesting text from literary point of view too (Lungu-Badea 2003: 99-100)
Text – injunctive / instructive	The injunctive / instructive text tries to induce certain acts, the obedience, or the criticist spirit. In the process of unfolding the acts it reaches from an initial state to a final state, the information being chronologically structures. In order to rebuild the meaning it employs advices, entreaties, order, and are used action, imperative verbs. It can be met in cocking recipes, instructions, game rules, publicity, propaganda etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 100-101)

Text – narrative	The narrative text (novels like those of Flaubert, Stendhal, Claude Simon, tales, comics, politics, diaries, epopees etc.) it presents real or imaginary facts unfolded in a certain period, going from an initial state to a final state, through a transformation process. The degrees of focusing place the narrator and his level of perceiving the events. Thus, the localization of zero degree indicate the omniscience narrator, the internal focalization shows that the narration is limited to the point of view of a sole character, and the external focalization makes the narrator and indifferent and ignorant witness. These perspective upon the events presuppose that the characters are implicitly or explicitly judged by narrator. Consequently, the reader's participation to action varies according to the register: comic, fantastic, realistic, or pathetic: impatience, identification to the characters etc. but it also depends on the alternation of the styles: direct, indirect, indirect-free etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 100-101)
Text – poetic	The poetic or rhetoric text (poems, epopees, poetical prose, songs, prayers, entreaties, slogans, proverbs, aphorisms, parodies, etc.) the concretize the poetical function of the language-use and they try to impress, to move. They are characterized by a tight connection between the expression's plans and the content's plan, and by the presence of the tropes. They determine diverse reactions to the authors: emotion, aesthetical reception, admiration, crisicist spirit, mobilization. To be seen in this sense also Delisle (1993: 46-47) and Les Types de Text (web) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 101)
Text – predictive	The predictive text emits hypothesis regarding the future it predicts something that will take place or it must take place; it is characterized by the presence of the state verbs, at future tense, at third person, the discourse being generalized. It is met in prophecies, weather forecasts etc. (Lungu-Badea 2003: 101)
Text – theatrical	The theatrical or conventional text (elaborated discourses, interviews, theatrical or Romanesque dialogue) present a structure close to the conversation and it is characterized by the use of the quotation marks, introducing verbs, hyphen, direct, indirect, and indirect-free discourse. The theatrical text is present in comedies, tragedies, drama, vaudevilles etc. (Moliere, Racine, Hugo, Musset) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 101)
Text mistakes	These types of corrections are made, of course, on the texts' level too, for instance while preparing for printing an article or a book, of while preparing new editions of a work. On these cases, there isn't, of course, about spelling or grammatical errors, but it is about text mistakes, about text segments which are absolutely "correct" in a certain *language*, but they do not correspond to the aimed meaning and, that's why they must be replaced (Coșeriu 2013: 166)
Text's level	There are a series of reasons opposing to considerate the text exclusively as a phenomenon of a certain historical *language*: 1) Normally, a text is worded in a certain *language*, but this

	doesn't necessarily happen. In principle, the plurilingual texts are, unquestionably, possible, and they exist in reality. It even happens– it is about limit case, I admit that – that different *languages* to seem as mixed within text even regarding the aspect of the material expression and of the grammar as, still, these hybrid formations are texts. Let's thing, for instance, at the last example of James Joyce's novel, Finnegan's Wake, concomitantly written in diverse *languages*; it doesn't contain only passages in English, but also in Italian and French – namely, almost totally amalgamated, merged in a new unit. 2) The texts do not unconditionally obey, on each point, the rules of a *language*; deviations from the rule of the respective *language* are always possible; and, what is even more important: usually, these deviations aren't interpreted as such, but they appear as fully acceptable, if they are motivated by the text's configuration of by a textual function. It is about a very general phenomenon, which could be formulated as the following: the text can suspend the rules of a *language*, which aren't valid in this special text, namely: a) either, simply, due to the traditional configuration of the respective text, or b) on the basis of a motivation which we can find within the respective text (Coșeriu 2013: 66)
Text's linguistics	In the present research, the text's linguistics is represented, though only partially, by the discipline called as "stylistic criticism" or "the stylistic of the speaking". The "semantic criticism" of Pagliaro it considers this level not only as "stylistic" aspect, but also under other aspects, referring to the interpretation of any type of texts (there can be juridical, economical etc. texts, not necessarily literary texts strictly speaking). Presently, they try on diverse ways to constitute a text's linguistics, by starting from the proposal which we have launched since 1955-1963. Despite these, the text's linguistics still is, by and large, very little developed, and many of its problems aren't studied or identified as such. This is demonstrated amongst others, by a difficulty frequently faced by the lecturers on foreign languages: the translation's problem (Coșeriu 2000: 243) The study object of the text's linguistics hasn't been identified, with exactness until now, so that the syntagm "text's linguistics" isn't, in a certain regard, nothing else but a name destined to designate very different approaching modalities, and even for completely different scientific disciplines. An even more reduced consensus we ascertain regarding the categories of the text's linguistics; each author introduces new concepts, as textem or representem, the suffix -em being especially productive in this domain (Coșeriu 2009: 50) The text's linguistics, respectively what we've called here the first linguistics or the "properly-said" linguistics of the texts it is a "linguistic of the sign" (Coșeriu 2013: 82)

The text's linguistics remain, that's right, forever a partial discipline of the semiotics, occupying itself with the signs, even if the linguistic signs function, usually, only as signifier. But the text's linguistics isn't by any means only a form of the linguistics, but it is rather a philology (in a sense that forgotten today). Yore, through philology they understood the art of interpreting the texts, on one hand on the basis of knowing the *language* those texts were composed in, but, on the other hand, also on the basis of the familiarity, achieved throughs study, with the material and spiritual culture which the respective texts appeared in. Thus, even Pagliaro had a very correct intuition when he catalogued his semantic criticism (a text's linguistics ante literram) as a new and developed form of the philological criticism. Of course, this doesn't mean that the text's linguistics could definitively renounce to the help of the general linguistics in all its interpretation efforts (Coșeriu 2013: 210)

The text's linguistics (…) concerns the texts as such, independently from certain *languages* and no matter if the texts are usually worded in a certain *language* (or in certain *languages*) (Coșeriu 2013: 211)

The reference point of this text's linguistics it is the distinction amongst the three levels in the frame of the *language-use*'s sphere, by and large, namely on the level of the speaking by and large, on the level of the individual *languages*, and on the level of the texts, three levels to which correspond, at their turn, three content types: the designation, the signification, and the meaning (Coșeriu 2013: 211)

The task of the text's linguistics consists of establishing and justifying the text's meaning. This fact corresponds with exactness to the activity which, in the sphere of the general linguistics, it is called as description, *language*'s description. But even in the sphere of the individual *languages*, to describe it means nothing else but to establish the *language*'s functions and to justify their existence by indicating a corresponding category on the expression's plan. Justifying the text means, correspondingly: reorienting the already understood meaning towards a certain expression, showing that to the signified of the macrosystem it corresponds within text a specific expression. Under this aspect, the text's linguistics which we are analyzing it here, it is interpretation, it is hermeneutics (Coșeriu 2013: 211)

For the literary texts offer, to the greatest extent, the frame of the full unfolding of the meaning, the object of the text's linguistics is, in the first place, the literature, the literary genre. But it is obvious that all the texts have a meaning, and not only the literary ones;

that's why, the "text's linguistics" must take in account non-literary texts, especially referring to the reduction of the possibility of developing the meaning, which we recognized in this types of texts (Coșeriu 2013: 212)

From this point of view, such a text's linguistics corresponds to the texts' stylistics, or, better said, it contains this type of stylistics, as it contains all the other types of texts processing, the entire methodological compound of the traditional philology (Coșeriu 2013: 212)

As any hermeneutics, the text's linguistics too, it must have an heuristics, which to provide it, at least partially, what it needs. This heuristics consists of identifying those procedures of expressing the meaning which can be encountered within texts. The heuristic componence of our linguistics of the text it consist of composing an as exhaustible as possible list of this type of procedures, which have already been attested in texts. We mustn't forget also that such a list must remain open, that we cannot be sure that, within a text, we encounter only the already identified and recorded procedures (Coșeriu 2013: 212)

From rational point of view, the text's linguistics as "meaning's linguistics" cannot claim a generality "downwardly", because its object forms the inferior level of any possible classification of the manifestations of the linguistics by and large. This linguistics of the text differs from linguistics by and large, as also the second type of text's linguistics: the trans-phraseological grammar. The science of the individual *languages* can claim a certain general validity both "downwards" and "upwards". "Downwards", on the measure which the procedures specific to a *language*, ascertained and justified, are valid for many or even for all the acts of speaking of a certain type. "Upwards", on the measure which these procedures can be common to certain *languages*, to several of them, or even top all the *languages*. In the last case it would be about empirical universals. To the text's linguistics as we understand it, whose object is constituted by the individual level of the linguisticity, it can be valid only a generality "upwards". We can establish only what can have different texts in common; the general validity, which can be claimed by this linguistics of the text. It refers, therefore, to the possible traits common to certain texts, to several texts, or, in limit-cases, to all texts. The scale the these possible common traits starts from the textual procedures fully fixed and finite, of expressing the meaning and it reaches up to macrostructures, which, on the expression plan, they no longer need to be unitary in a strict sense. (…) On a higher stage, we find more general procedures, which no longer prove a full homogeneousness on the expression's plan, for instance diverse techniques for starting a text, as there would be the introducing of

	the theme or even the entrance in medias res, namely where it is creates us the impression that the theme would be already known, that the respective text would be only a commentary amongst others on a theme common to several texts. On an even higher level, we find the possible unitary macrostructures, which no longer need to be in detailed concordance concerning the procedures. We are, on this time, on the level of the genres, within which one can ascertain an "downwards" variation, very well defined. And, finally, we leave the domain of the common traits empirically ascertainable; for texts in general there exist only common traits definitory to their level (Coșeriu 2013: 212-213) On the extent which the meaning is expressed within the texts in, not only linguistically, but also extra-linguistically, - and this happened to a large extent -, this linguistics of the text, which I consider "the authentical one", it must go beyond the *language*'s sphere (Coșeriu 2013: 214)
Texts' traditions, independent from language	The texts have also totally special traditions, namely independently from a certain language (Coșeriu 2013: 69)
Textual functions	There still are a great number of other functions which do not belong either to the *languages*' level or to the level of the speaking by and large. It is about functions of the peaking in a certain situation, about functions regarding on each time a certain purpose of the speaking. For instance, we cannot say that through a question is designated, simply, something extralinguistic (Coșeriu 2013: 76)
Textual sign	Analogue to the distinction operated by Saussure between signifier and signified (French: signifiant and signifié), valid for the linguistic sign, we usually distinguish in the case of the textual sign between signifier and signified: the signification and the designation constitute together the signifier component, and the meaning constitutes the signified component of the textual signs (Coșeriu 2013: 80)
Thematic context	The thematic context is a limit case of the verbal direct context (…) In any work, each chapter, and even, up to a certain point, each word, they have a certain signification related to what it has been already said, and what it has been already said, it gains, with each new paragraph, up to the last paragraph, a new and more complete meaning. We speak therefore about the report between theme and rheme, but not on the sentence's level, but on the text's level. Here too, the text proves to be a superior level: the theme and the rheme of a sentence or of several sentences, they can represent, take together, the theme or the rheme of a text (Coșeriu 2013: 198)
Traditional object of the linguistics	Namely the historical plan of the *language-use*. This plan can be identified, as we've seen, to the plan of the *languages*, namely to the plan of the typical technical traditions of the *language-use*,

	historically determined, of certain communities (Coșeriu 2000: 250)
Traditional practical grammar	In the traditional practical grammar it is often applied the transformation's principle, especially as didactical means. (…) the practical grammars recommend the transformation of the expression from active to passive, even in cases which the passive expression is unnatural in (Coșeriu 2000: 219)
	The traditional grammars of the maternal *language* are destined to the speakers who already know, even if intuitively, the constructions and the functions (the what and the why) of their *language*, so that in such grammars these aspects aren't practically ever integrally described or applied (Coșeriu 2000: 74)
Translation's problem	Actually, what is being translated? Obviously, one cannot cross directly from a *language* to another on the *languages*' plan itself, by deluding ourselves that everything can be translated or must be translated "directly" from the grammar and the lexicon belonging to the *language* A in those ones belonging to the *language* B, being given the fact that what is being translated isn't ever simply the "*language*", but it is always a certain text. Or, when one studies the grammar and the lexicon of a foreign *language*, the comparison is done, in the best scenario, on the level of the *languages* and, by having only the results of this comparison, the translator face a problem which, obviously, he cannot solve it by using these instruments: the problem of establishing the correspondence between a text belonging to a *language* "x" and a text belonging to his own *language* (or vice versa). Let's, for instance, think at the so-called "idiomatic expressions", namely at the semantically "non-analyzable" expressions (which global value doesn't correspond to the sum of their elements) and which, consequently, are translated entirely, as texts or as fragments of texts (Coșeriu 2000: 234-235)
	In addition to that, the translator must know, not only what it is translated like, but also what represents what he has to translated and what, eventually, it is not translated (or, a contrary, what must be added) (Coșeriu 2000: 243-244)
	The translation's problem, as one can deduce it from these brief observations, it is, fundamentally, a problem of the text's linguistics: when we translate, we must ask ourselves what is like, and what one would say in the same situation in another *language*, or in another linguistic community, which are characterized by cultural traditions differing from ours (Coșeriu 2000: 244)
Trans-phrasal grammar / trans-phrasal analysis	In the current situation, it seems to me as more important than presenting firm proposals for the terminological norming, to indicate, with the whole necessary clarity, the fact that the object of this type of text's linguistics it is constituted by the text as level of the idiomatic structuring and that, consequently, this text's

	linguistics doesn't coincide to the "meaning's linguistics", whose research object is the texts on the level of the *language* by and large. Even in this domain of the text's linguistics, with an idiomatic orientation, during the las years have been recorded remarkable results and, in what concerns the level of the technical elaboration, it has been reached a very high level (Coșeriu 2013: 215)
True versus false	The "truth" and the "false" aren't traits of the words, but of the speaking (Coșeriu 2011: 47)
Thematization	The thematization if a modality of highlighting an element, of valuing it through various typographical techniques (italics, quotations marks, capitals, or by using a modal verb in English language, for instance: must, or an emphatic structure of presenting, or a repetition (…) (Lungu-Badea 2003: 94)
Thesis of the articulation basis	An individual belonging to an ethnic group could have because of that a certain congenital configuration of the phonator organs, a specific articulation basis; this wouldn't aloo him to correctly articulate sound characteristic to other ethnic groups; for instance, to an Englishman it would be physiologically impossible to pronounce certain sounds of the French language. Consequently, in the case of an ethnic group adopting the language of another group, the learnt language would present a system of phonology different form the original one, due to the articulation basis of the ones who have learnt it. It is a theory that can sometimes have an appearance of truth, but which is still inacceptable, because – as it has been told also in the discussion caused by it as congress – it is based on a wrong interpretation of the facts cited as proves. Rightly so, the articulation basis doesn't exist as anatomical-physiological reality, but it is essentially a habituation. What happens in reality, it isn't the fact that individuals belonging to different ethnic groups would have phonation organs differing under anatomical aspect, but that, simply, they are used to a certain pronunciation, to a system of phonology and, consequently, they have difficulties when adopting phonemes different from those known by them and usually pronounced by them (Coșeriu 1999: 78-79)
Thesis of the articulation habituation	Consequently, we must replace the notion of articulation basis for that of articulation habituation. In other words, it isn't about an impossibility of pronouncing certain sounds, but only about a certain inertia in adapting the phonation organs to the phonological systems which aren't our own. Even more appropriate would be, perhaps, not to even speak about "articulation habits", but rather about what Trubetzkoy called as phonological conscience or phonological "sieve"; namely that mental habituation which an individual usually speaks a language through, a language characterized by a phonological system and he doesn't notice on each case the phonologic la distinctions characteristic to other systems and, consequently, he assimilated

	certain phonemes foreign to the phonemes seeming similar or, sometimes, those phonemes seem to him as being identical to the phonemes from his own system (Coșeriu 1999: 79)
Time – "that passes"	The "passing time" it is just that conceived – or imagined – as an infinite linearity, motionless or not. In linguistics, where the represented time uses the background or the "grid" in order to study the "said" time, especially of the verb tenses, there have been proposed in this regard diverse models; and each one of these models claim (or aspire) to correspond to the time or, at least, to the objective time from logical point of view, namely to the mode which the report between the presented time and the said time, it is conceived by language (Coșeriu 2009: 343)
Time – exterior or "externalized"	The exterior or "externalized" time can be represented, at its turn, in diverse languages as "circumstantial" time, dependent or "interrogative", without later subdivisions and as autonomous or "positive" time. Actually, there is a mode of conceiving the objective time as abstraction and generic time of the corresponding question (and of the answer o this question) or the "when" as being "something" (Coșeriu 2009: 342)
Time – objective, of the things and of the events	The objective time of the things and of the events, to the extent that it is about facts concretely representable, we can imagine it even as "toppled over", on the condition not to speak about them (Coșeriu 2009: 350)
Time - relative / "grammatical"	In order to understand which mode this time is relative or "grammatical" in, it is re-corelated to the represented or "lexical" time, we have to have in our sight two things: a) the verbal tenses do not designate punctual positions, but temporal contexts and, in a way, unlimited contexts; b) the grammatical time can be structured through criteria differing form the criteria applied to the lexical time (Coșeriu 2009: 346)

The grammatical time can have ulterior subdivisions, namely smaller domains inside the bigger domains (Coșeriu 2009: 347)

The structure of the "said" grammatical time, namely of the reports between positions in time, it can thus be much more complex and, in this case, even radically different from that of the "called" or lexical time (Coșeriu 2009: 347) |
| Time – represented (called) or lexical | In order to understand which mode this time is relative or "grammatical" in, it is re-corelated to the represented or "lexical" time, we have to have in our sight two things: a) the verbal tenses do not designate punctual positions, but temporal contexts and, in a way, unlimited contexts; b) the grammatical time can be structured through criteria differing form the criteria applied to the lexical time (Coșeriu 2009: 346)

The "called" time is always linear, unidimensional, on a sole plan (even when imagined as two lines in a contrary movement, as in those model trying to comprise the immediate report between time |

	in itself and the position in time). Instead, the "called" time can be a time on several plans. Thus, in the Romance languages are clearly distinguished in the verbal system the two temporal plans: the actual plan of the "effective" facts, constituted of present, of a "far" past and of future, with their subdivisions (…) and the unactual plan, which the event are placed on in order to be diminished, in their reality, or in their "effectivity" (for instance, because they constitute only the background of the happenings in cause, or because the facts are presented as not happened, as hypothetical, as uncertain, as depending on certain conditions etc.) (Coșeriu 2009: 347)
Tonality	From musical point of view, a phonic group, considered in its ensemble, it appears as a melodic line constituting its tonality (Coșeriu 1999: 105)
Topic	The order of the words in sentence or of the sentences in phrase; part of the syntax or of the stylistics studying the order of the words in sentence and of the sentences in phrase; argument of general nature, appliable in all analogue cases; common places; naming places, localities (www.Dex.ro)
Toponymy	Historical (etymological) study of the names of the places (Coșeriu 1999: 100)
Trait – distinctive	A functional minimal difference between two language units, it is called distinctive trait (Coșeriu 2000: 191)
Traits – non-positive	(only mentioned) (Coșeriu 2000: 195)
Transformation	What the generative-transformational grammar adds as novelty to the already traditional notions of the structuralism, it is just the concept of "transformation", a concept which, without being original in itself, it still can be considered as a discovery given the fact that even highlighting this phenomenon it already represent a remarkable methodological innovation. The origins of this concept are traditional and, in a way, even obvious. Already at the end of the past century (XX Century, E. l. t.'s n.) the French researcher in logics' domain, Louis Conturat, he considered the word as exit, as arrival etc. nominal transformations of the verbs themselves to exit, to arrive etc. and the compared grammar of the Indo-European languages (especially of the Celtic ones) was interested in the "action names" or in "verbal names" (Coșeriu 2000: 218)

The "transformations", to the extent which they are constitutive part of the language in, they belong to the knowledge which the speaker has, regarding to his language. Interpreted like that, the transformation can explain two functional aspects (this in the frame itself of the conception about functionality, promoted by structuralism): the difference of function and its contrary, the unit of function (Coșeriu 2000: 224)

The "transformations" (the "real" transformations and the one which are only relations amongst paradigms) are extremely |

	important, both in the domain of describing a language, and in the domain of comparing between different languages, being specific to the respective languages or representing constitutive procedures, open possibilities – and eventually unlimited – of linguistic production (or creation) (Coșeriu 2000: 232)
Translation	And certain activity related to language-use, as there is, for instance, the translation, are possible only by starting from the tacit hypothesis that in diverse languages we can relate to the same extralinguistic sphere. Of this consists the possibility of the translation, namely of saying what has been said regarding the so-called "extralinguistic reality", which can be designated or named both through language (Coșeriu 2013: 63)
Type as position in time "said" by a language-use	There are two fundamental functions of the language-use, already identified by Plato, in The Sophist: "to name" and "to say", functions corresponding within languages, broadly, to lexicon and to grammar (Coșeriu 2009: 344)
Type of texts	Identifying the types of texts; let's take, for instance, a newspaper article. It is quite easy to speak about a textual species called "newspaper article", for the common traits of the concrete examples of this textual species are much more numerous than, for instance, the examples form the literature's domain. But amongst the literary texts too, there are sufficient common traits in order to reach an intelligent and fundamental establishing of the texts species. Of course, such a text species cannot "explain" in totality any of the concrete texts which are subsumed up to it, it cannot fully "exhaust" its content; the textual species bring order in the had to handle multiplicity of what must be comprised with the sigh and it spares us of inutile interpretative ambages and wanderings (Coșeriu 2013: 169)
Types / fundamental: of combinatory meanings	These fundamental types of combinatory actions, implying delimitations, sentences, and relational-axial constructions, they aren't difficult to recognize and to analyze, except in the cases which the expressions designating event are transformed from verbs in substantives into, or when a nominal derivate includes several semantic classes. For instance, in the term musician there are two semantic classes: an object identifying the involved person, as also the professional activity of that person. Although, in the combination a good musician, good doesn't qualify the person, but the person's capacity of performing an activity (Nida 2004: 103)
Types of communication	Withing speaking we must distinguish to types of communication: "communicating something to somebody" and "communicating himself to somebody" – "entering the contact with another". From empirical perspective, the first type of communication is so broad, than it seems to be inseparably tied to the reality of the speaking; this type isn't, though, essential to the language-use, it doesn't represent a definitory criterion to "language-use". If it missed, the speaking wouldn't become a non-speaking. Neither in the daily life we evaluate the "linguisticity" of the speaking acts from the

	perspective of this type of communication; we won't context the linguisticity of a verbal expression only because we have ascertained that through it nothing have been communicated to anybody. The second communication type it necessarily belong to the language, it is the communication with another, the fact that the speaking is always directed towards somebody, that it is based on somebody's existence, the fact that the language-use always exists for another, even when that other person doesn't understand what has been expressed. This second communication form, which the dimension that I call as the alterity of the language-use it manifests in, it represents, without any doubt, a definitory criterion for the concept of language-use. Actually, we do not know ever whether we are understood, we cannot know this, at least objectively, but by speaking we confer to another the capacity of speaking and, thus, we demonstrate that we know that himself is a subject, another person too. Concerning the recipient of the speaking, a speaking understood in this mode, it can be, actually, either about another person, or about the speaker himself. The language-use is directed towards somebody else in the last case too. We speak as we are ourselves another person, to that, for instance, in our internal soliloquies, as one ca easily notice it, the self is most often approached through you. Likewise happens when we speak to the things too; we speak as the thing could understand us, so that we confer the things a human character (Coșeriu 2013: 95)
Types of existence	These classifications, these "classes" or, better said, these types of existence (including the "nature" and the "world") are firstly mediated by language-use – through the words' significations; and just because of that, the respective "things" can be "designated by their "name"", namely they can be deduced out of the signification which their type of existence corresponds to (Coșeriu 2009: 67)
Types of linguistic content	Distinguishing the three levels of the language-use it is very important and necessary from rational point of view, for to these one correspond the three levels of functionality, the three types of linguistic "content": the designation, the signified, and the meaning (strata which, of course, in text are presented simultaneously) (Coșeriu 2000: 246-247)
Types of linguistics	Other two types of linguistics, beside the well-known linguistics of the languages, whose study object is constituted of the description or of the history of the historical languages, corresponding thus to the second level mentioned by us; a delimitation which to be in concordance with the differentiation of the three level in the domain of the facts of language-use, namely the differentiation, beside the well-known linguistics of the languages (level 2), of a linguistic of the speaking by and large (level 1) and of a linguistics of the texts or of text's linguistics (level 3) (Coșeriu 2013: 26)
Types of regional common language	A "septentrional" type, a "meridional" type, a "central" type. These varieties are rather determined by the respective "subjacent"

	dialects (Coșeriu 1999: 73)
Types of sentences indicating a state	The sentences indicating a state can include a verb neutral from semantic point of view, as "to be": John is ill; or a verb indicating some kind of event: the dog appeared dead (Nida 2004: 103)
Types of sentences indicating the appurtenance to a class	The sentences indicating the appurtenance to a class, they include wordings as: John is a teacher and Bill is a doctor (Nida 2004: 103)
Types of sentences indicating the identity	The identity can be expressed either as an open sentence, for instance: Melvile Thomson is the head of the bank, or as a sentence in the appositional construction: Thomson, the head of the bank (Nida 2004: 103)
Types of sentences referring to events	:events with actors, events with immediate agents, events with causative agents, event without participants, processes (Nida 2004: 103)
Types of sentences relational-axial	The relational-axial constructions consist of two parts, which the first one marks the relation and the second one marks the axis in. Behold a few typical constructions of this genre: in the house, behind the building, and along ; these mark relations, while the axes are the constituents: the house, the building, the road. The rational-axial constructions having the events as second element, they occur in expressions of by going type: after the banquet, during the strike etc. (Nida 2004: 103) When the relational-axial construction has a sentence as second element, the first element will often be called a conjunction. Ex.: if he comes, when they arrived, because he ate late (Nida 2004: 103)
Types of structuring the semantic fields	The semantic fields cover a domain of the extralinguistic reality that must receive a form. So, for instance, the names of colors form a language represent a structuring specific to that language, of the entire luminous spectrum, and the terms designating the temperature, as: warm, moderate, cold etc. they structure, from the perspective of the respective language the continuum of the temperatures range which a man can feel. It isn't without importance either to establish which secondary structures of the lexicon are associated to the global structure of such a semantic field (Coșeriu 2013: 109)
Types of style (Hjelmslev)	: creative style type, reproductive style type, the so-called normal style type; there are mixt types of style too (Coșeriu 2013: 152)
Types of truth at Thomas Aquinas	Thomas Aquinas distinguished, somehow in passing, three types of "truth": - the concept's truth, given when ens et verum convertuntur (Latin): "the being and the truth merge"; unde videtur quod etiam simplex conceptio intellectus […] non careat veritate et falsitate (Latin): "where one can notice from that neither the simple concept lacks the truth or the falsehood (it can be submitted to the categories of "true" or "false"; - the truth of the thing itself: quia etiam res dicitur vera vel falsa,

	sicut dicimus aurum verum vel falsum (Latin): as, for instance, when we speak about true (veritable) of false gold" - the truth as relation between what exists and what is said or known. According to Aristotle, this third type of truth would be veritas […] in dicente velcognoscente verum (Latin): "truth (…) of the one who says or knows the truth" (Coșeriu 2011: 200)

U	

Unitary signified (the functionality principle)	Distinct linguistic norm, in grammar and in lexicon, it must be, firstly, presupposed a unique signified, namely a signified unitarily valid for all the context which the respective form occurs in, and which to be able to justify the acceptations of this form as being motivated by contextual determinations. Rightly so – given the solidarity of the *language*'s plans – if it is necessary to exist a difference of expression in order there to be a difference of signified, it won't be less necessary us to admit as principle the fact that, if there isn't a difference of expression, the diverse possible acceptations of a form will have to correspond to the same area of signification (…) and everything that belong s to this "area" it constitutes a manifestation of the same signified as value of *language*. The same thing is valid, of course, to the ensembles of grammatical and lexical synonyms, which are implicitly recognized as forms corresponding to the same signified. In this concern, we must distinguish between a unique signified and a unitary signified, and, in parallel, between polysemy and the semantic variation (Coșeriu 2000: 174) The signified of a form can, consequently, to no longer be "unique", because there are polysemic forms (forms having more than one signified); but any *language* signified – both a "unique" signified of a univocal form, and each of the signified of a polysemic form – it must be interpreted as the "unitary" signified. This fact, on the other hand, independently from any structural principle, it has its empirical foundation in the knowledge we have regarding the *languages*. It is equally rationally justified, because otherwise couldn't be explained why the speakers use the same form for numerous acceptations, often very different ones, and not only for acceptations already given in the current contexts, but also for "odd" acceptations or in a totally new contexts (Coșeriu 2000: 176) Through the corollary of the unitary signified it isn't denied the possibility of the homophony or of the lexical and grammatical "polysemy" – which is a phenomenon that can be empirically

ascertained (though it isn't rationally necessary) -, but there is made the distinction between polysemy and variation, being established a rational order and a priority in researching and describing the *languages*. According to this corollary, before we will opt for homophony, we must ask ourselves if there isn't about variation: in all case which the homophonies or the polysemy wouldn't be obvious (for instance, for they are forms belonging to different paradigms) – especially in the case of the "categorial" facts: of the grammatical and lexical procedures – we must examine, in the first place, what the *languages* must contain in order to exist as such, namely, invariants of signified or "unitary signified". Only when is absolutely impossible "to reduce" al the acceptations of a form to a unitary *language* value, it will be suitable to admit the homophony, as, on the other hand, different forms, which still can be attributed a unitary signified, are identified as "synonyms". In other words, we must distinguish from the beginning and constantly, between the "signified" itself and the "acceptation", between the signified functional autonomously – or "the signified of *language*" – and the "signified of speaking", between the "constant signified" and the 'occasional signified". What, without any doubt, in practice is more difficult than admitting anticipately polysemy of any kind. This leads us to understand the way which the *languages* effectively function in, while by admitting the polysemy as structuring principle of the signified and confounding it to the variation, besides the fact of being a decision lacking a rational foundation, it brakes the research and it doesn't bring it to anything, not even to delimit and to explain the polysemy itself. Rightly so, these ones cannot be delimited as such only from the point of view of the unitary signified and relatedly to them (Coșeriu 2000: 176)

"To reduce" the acceptations of a form to a unitary signified it doesn't mean, on the other hand, to reduce them to a sole "punctual" signified, neither to ignore the multitude of the usage of the respective forms, but, as it has been mentioned, it means delimitating in accordance with the *language* an area of semantic variability which they belong to and which they find all their acceptation in, all the ascertained forms, and other forms as well, still not ascertained in the linguistic use. In this sense, there are three fundamental types of unitary signified, types which we only signal them here and characterize them by and large: a first type, which can be the most frequent, it is the unitary signified comprising or "containing" the acceptations; namely, each acceptation (or semantic variant) it is this unitary signified plus a contextual determination. This is the type that we encounter in the case of the verbal tenses, at least in our *languages* (Coșeriu 2000: 176-177)

The second type of unitary signified – which, too, it seems to be quite frequent -, it is a basic signified, characteristic to certain

	uses, it justifies the other types of variant despite the fact that it doesn't actually "contain" them. These last one can be even more numerous and more frequent than the uses directly expressed by the basic signified (Coșeriu 2000: 177)
	The third type of unitary signified "contains" its acceptations (namely it constitutes the basis for each of them), but in the same time the types of acceptations behave as they would be placed on a certain order, so that, as in the previous case, if one is excluded, one passes to the next one (Coșeriu 2000: 180)
Universal assertions	The universal assertion like: *The man is a rational animal*, they surely aren't "atemporal", but they refer to a unlimited or "eternal" present; they do not limit the time (Coșeriu 2009: 346)
Unlimited" temporal contexts	The temporal contexts are "unlimited" in the sense that they can be prolonged indefinitely (Coșeriu 2009: 346)
Unity and diversity of the present linguistics	The four principles which we have examined, or at least the first three of them, they configure the ideal unity of the present linguistics, in its "modern" and "untraditional" form. Such a unity doesn't exclude, though, but in a way even imply its internal differentiation, so that the present linguistics presents, as it has been said, a variety of currents and orientations. This, in conformity with one of the particularities determining the ideal unity: the focusing upon theory and upon methodology. In other words, the epistemological "formal" unity is that justifying the "substantial" variety of the present linguistics, the epistemological formal and generic motivation being the same: the primate attributed to the theory and to the methods, though these theory and methods are something different and some other times even radically different. The unity of the present linguistics must be interpreted, consequently, as unity in diversity; and vice versa, its variety must be interpreted as the manifestation of the same unique principle (but this doesn't mean that all the theories would be equally valid and acceptable) (Coșeriu 2000: 82)
Universality	The universality (…) is the condition of ascertaining the common traits in objects, the necessary mode of existing of certain objects: what belongs to the concept of an object or it can be deduced out of concept, namely the ensemble of these traits, which no object would be without, what it is. And these traits aren't necessary to be abstracted on the basis of the observation, because we previously know that they are present in objects; in a contrary case, the objects wouldn't be what they are (Coșeriu 2000: 38)

V	

Variation	The "variation" is the diversity of acceptations (contextual values) of the same signified of language (Coșeriu 2000: 176)
Vibrant	They are close to the fricatives, and are produced through an intermittent occlusion (Coșeriu 1999: 118)
Vibrations (main and secondary)	The recorded wave presents main and secondary vibrations. The general trajectory of the main vibrations, being about analogue phonic continuums, it presents a profile more or less analogue, even when corresponding to different subjects (Coșeriu 1999: 104)
Voice's timbre	The secondary vibrations, instead, they reveal themselves as distinct, they being the ones corresponding to what we call the voice's timbre (Coșeriu 1999: 104)
Vowels	Sounds exclusively produced by the vocal cords, which articulation the rest of the phonator apparatus intervenes in, only as a resonance box, and as modulator factor (Coșeriu 1999: 111) The vowels are divided in three classes: medial (a), anterior (e, î), and posterior (o, u). A is a vowel having a maximal aperture of the phonator apparatus, namely in articulating it the tongue remains in repose position. At the anterior vowels, the pre-dorsal area of the tongue is elevated towards the palate at the posterior vowels – the pre-dorsal area (Coșeriu 1999: 111) All the vowels are continuous (Coșeriu 1999: 112) Normally, the vowels are sonant, but sometimes they can function as "consonants" (Coșeriu 1999: 112) All the vowels are sonorous, and from the point of view of the function of the nasal cavity, they can be oral or nasal (Coșeriu 1999: 116)
Vowels - delabialized	There are, too, languages which delabialized posterior vowels are in (Coșeriu 1999: 111)
Vowels – labial	There are languages having anterior labialized vowels (Coșeriu 1999: 111)
Vowels – labialized	There are languages having anterior labialized vowels (Coșeriu 1999: 111)

W

Word / words	The words, in a linguistic system, they aren't presented isolated, but they are assembled in analogical categories, whose structure it often doesn't depend on their signified, but on purely morphological aspects (Coșeriu 1999: 125)
Writing	The writing, in its most common aspects, it isn't else but a system of symbolic signs parallel to the articulated *language-use*, for it reproduces this one by using other signs. This isn't true for any

	writing, of course, because the pictographic writing, used by many "primitive" people, it doesn't translate, in parallel mode, phrases and words; neither the ideographic writing does it; for instance, the Chinese's writing, which doesn't present phonic words, but ideas, concepts, and consequently it constitutes a partially autonomous system, which can be read "without words" and it could be interpreted not only in Chinese but in any other *language*. But the most usual writings, as there is the syllabic one and the "phonetic" one, they reproduce, effectively, with a greater or smaller exactness, the articulated speaking (Coșeriu 1999: 22)
	Φύσει/θέσει – (nature/place) opposition

Sadly, in the histories of the linguistics, they do not speak in a differentiated manner about a φύσει-θέσει opposition, referring to the essence of the linguistic signs form Antiquity up, at least, to the Renaissance, being established that the more recent linguistic theory – as, also, many thinkers from Antiquity – it has been decisive for imposing the φύσει conception (namely for "conventionality", respectively for the "arbitrary character" of the names). In reality, though, the φύσει-θέσει opposition, in this form, it appeared later, after the Aristotelian period (Coșeriu 2009: 54)

Why the φύσει/θέσει referring to the *language-use*? For – and this is our cultural-historical thesis – the Greeks saw a problem in the fact that all the words (the sonorous forms of them) "have", each one, a given signification in a *language*, being so "name" for certain "things", (…) and they always questioned themselves regarding the cause and the meaning of the relation: "name"-"thing". In other cultures, for instance in the Indian culture, there aren't formulated problems regarding the relation: sonorous form of the word – signification of the word, and, especially, the relation "name"-"thing', namely: they do not ask questions regarding the cause generating these significations (Coșeriu 2009: 55)

Thirdly, even the meaning of φύσει is different, despite the material identity of the expression in the three phases of the opposition. In the case of the first phase, φύσει refers to the nature of the designated things, thus implying also the question if these ones require or not a certain imitative designation, respectively a descriptive one, or, at least, if for the "original names" it must be presupposed or not a material analogy between the things' nature and the words' nature which they delimitate. Regarding the second phase of the opposition, φύσει refers to the nature of the sounds, implying the question if a "natural" sound can be name for itself, a hypothesis, otherwise, infirmed. In any case, the eventual analogy between the sonorous form of the word and the designated thing it is important for the functional statute of the names (even if this belongs to the etymological motivation of a word): it isn't a ratio

	of the word's existence (cf. Fn, 5). To the third phase of the opposition, φύσει reveals the signification of original analogical structure of the name and of the thing; in the case of accepting the φύσει solution, this eventual analogy cannot be considered as cause of the name's functioning, but only a motivation of the naming: the imitative words would be "names" by convention, not being naturally motivated (Coşeriu 2009: 56)

Bibliography

Published in Volumes:

COȘERIU, Eugeniu. 1999. *Introducere în lingvistică*. Trad. de Elena Ardeleanu și Eugenia Bojoga; Cuvânt înainte de Mircea Borcilă. - Ed. a 2-a. - Cluj-Napoca: Echinocțiu.

COȘERIU, Eugeniu. 2000. *Lecții de lingvistică generală*. Trad. din limba spaniolă Eugenia Bojoga, Cuvânt înainte de Mircea Borcilă, Cluj-Napoca: Editura ARC.

COȘERIU, Eugeniu. 2009. *Omul și limbajul său. Studii de filozofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii și lingvistică generală*. Antologie, argument, note, bibliografie și indici de Dorel Frînaru, Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza".

COȘERIU, Eugeniu. 2011. *Istoria filozofiei limbajului. De la începuturi până la Rousseau*. București: Humanitas.

COȘERIU, Eugeniu. 2013. *O introducere în hermeneutica sensului. Lingvistica textului*. Versiune românească și index de Eugen Munteanu și Ana-Maria Prisacaru, cu o postfață de Eugen MunteanuIași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza".

EUGENE, A. Nida. 2004. *Traducerea sensurilor* (stud. introd., interviu, trad. și note de Rodica Dimitriu). Iași: Institutul European.

GRUIA, Sorin. 2014. *Discursul religios – structură și tipuri*, Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza".

LUNGU BADEA, Georgiana. 2003. *Mic dicționar de termeni utilizat în teoria, practica și didactica traducerii*. Timișoara: Orizonturi Universitare.

MARIN, Mihaela, NEDELCIU, Carmen. 2004. *Dicționar de termeni literari*. Ediția a Ii-a revizuită. București: ALL EDUCATIONAL.

METEA, Alexandru. 2003. *Limba română esențială*. Oradea:, Editura Imprimeriei de Vest.

NIDA, Eugene A., TABER, Charles R. 1982. (Helps for Translators, Prepared under the Auspices of the United Bible Societies, volume III) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Published by E. J. Brill, Leiden;

NIDA, Eugene A., WAARD, Jan de. 1986. *From one Language to Another. Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers;

SEBEOK, Thomas A.2002. *O Introducere în semiotică*, traducere în limba română de Sorin Mărculescu, București: Humanitas.

Articles:

BASTIN, Georges L. „Adaptation, the Paramount Communication Strategy", *Linguaculture*. Feb. 2014, Vol. 2014 Issue 1, p73-87. 15p. DOI: 10.1515/lincu-2015-0013.

EYL, Jennifer. 2014. „Method & Theory in the Study of Religion". *Linguaculture* .Vol. 26 Issue 4/5, p315-339. 25p., pp. 317-318.